

THE SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY

8709

CONTENTS

THE PUBLIC FINANCES OF NORTH CAROLINA SINCE 1920 <i>Benjamin Ulysses Ratchford</i>	1
STATE CONTROL OF EDUCATION . . . <i>Edgar W. Knight</i>	16
THE NEGRO IN RECENT SOUTHERN LITERATURE <i>Harold P. Marley</i>	29
THE HUMAN SIDE OF FRANCIS LIEBER <i>Louis Martin Sears</i>	42
THE FRENCH COLONIAL ARRÊT OF 1784 <i>Frederick L. Nussbaum</i>	62
GEORGE N. SANDERS—AMERICAN PATRIOT OF THE FIFTIES <i>Merle E. Curtis</i>	79
RUSKIN THE PROFESSOR <i>Jason Almus Russell</i>	88
BOOK REVIEWS	96

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY FOR
THE SOUTH ATLANTIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
BY THE DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DURHAM, N. C., U. S. A.

Issued in the months of January, April, July, and October
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER AT THE POSTOFFICE AT DURHAM

The South Atlantic Quarterly

Edited by William K. Boyd and William H. Wannamaker

Officers: Robert L. Flowers, Pres., Albert M. Webb, Vice-Pres., D. W. Newsom, Sec.-Treas.
Directors: W. P. Few, Wm. H. Glasson, R. L. Flowers, Wm. H. Wannamaker, D. W. Newsom

FOUNDED IN 1902 BY THE 9019 SCHOLARSHIP SOCIETY OF TRINITY COLLEGE

This journal was founded in January, 1902, in order to afford better opportunity in the South for discussion of literary, historical, economic, and social questions. It knows no sectional jealousy and aims to offer a publishing medium in which respectful consideration will be accorded to all who have some worthy contribution to make in its chosen field.

For their journal the editors and publishers solicit the support of thinking people in all sections of the country and especially in the South. Communications in regard to articles, book reviews, and editorial matters should be addressed to the Editors, SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY, Duke University, Durham, N. C. Subscriptions and all communications relating to advertisements and business matters should be addressed to the Duke University Press, Durham, N. C.

Subscriptions payable in advance. Advertising accounts payable after first insertion of ad.

Contents of Last Two Numbers

July, 1927

Governmental Regulations of Campaign Contributions and Expenditures	Earl R. Sikes
Reminiscences of General Robert E. Lee, 1865-68.....	George Taylor Lee
Henry Adams.....	Henry Commager
Barère, Anacreon of the Guillotine.....	Leo Gershoy
Is Dickens Still a Hero?.....	H. H. Kidd
Business Ideals, Old and New.....	J. Fred Rippy
De Magistris Populi.....	Robert Withington
Book Reviews	

October, 1927

Killing the Goose with the Golden Eggs.....	Marvin McKendree Black, Jr.
Are We Americanizing the Immigrant?.....	Harold Fields
Brother Jonathan to John Bull.....	Robert E. Spiller
Jefferson and Adams at Ease.....	J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton
Double Representation and Vote by Head Before the French Revolution	George Gordon Andrews
The Librarian and the Novelist.....	Charles H. Compton
The New York Press and Andrew Johnson.....	Marguerite Hall Albjerg
Book Reviews	

Copyright, 1928, by Duke University Press

The South Atlantic Quarterly

Volume XXVII

JANUARY, 1928

Number 1

THE PUBLIC FINANCES OF NORTH CAROLINA SINCE 1920

BENJAMIN ULYSSES RATCHFORD

Cornell University

TODAY North Carolina occupies a high position among the states of the Union in regard to general state activities, such as money spent for highways, education, and other enterprises. Only a few years ago she was far down the list. Figures of the United States Census Bureau show that in the matter of state expenditures for the ten year period 1915-25, North Carolina had a greater increase than any other state, that increase being 847%. The next highest was 764%, while the average for all the states was only 301.2%. In the total amount of the expenditures North Carolina was sixth among the states in 1925. In reality this great advance was made in five years instead of ten, for North Carolina did not start her program of expansion and development until 1920. The story of this rapid and unprecedented growth in public finance is indeed an interesting one. The essential parts of that story are here considered, starting with the failure, or partial failure, of the Revaluation movement in 1920-21.¹ For convenience the discussion is arranged by topics rather than in strict chronological order.

REVALUATION

The revaluation reform of 1919-20 increased the value of taxable property in North Carolina from \$1,099,120,389

¹For discussions of the Revaluation reform and conditions leading up to it, see Raper, C. L., "North Carolina's Taxation Problem and its Solution", *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol. XIV, No. 1; Pearson, C. Chilton, "The Present Status of Tax Reform in North Carolina", (*Ibid.*, Vol. XVIII, No. 4); and Francis Nash, "Revaluation and Taxation in North Carolina", (*Ibid.*, Vol. XIX, No. 4.)

to \$3,156,243,202. The extra session of the General Assembly in 1920 removed all state taxes from property except a small school tax, and greatly increased all license, franchise, and corporation taxes. The people, in the 1920 election, adopted by a large majority three constitutional amendments proposed as a part of the revaluation reform. These amendments, all to Article V of the Constitution, prescribed \$1 and \$2 respectively as the maximums for county and state poll taxes, limited the combined state and county tax on property to 15 cents per \$100, of which the State could not levy more than 5 cents, and made all incomes taxable at a rate of not over 6 per cent. Previously incomes from taxed property were not taxable. The section permitting counties to make special levies on property with the consent of the General Assembly was retained.

During 1920, even before the first taxes had been levied on the new property values fixed by the revaluation, there was opposition to the new high values. This opposition continued and grew, especially among the farmers. By the time the General Assembly of 1921 met, the full effects of the post-war business slump were being felt, and there was an insistent demand for a reduction of the high assessments. At one time a delegation representing the farmers appeared before the Joint Finance Committee of the House and Senate to plead for a reduction of the assessments. This delegation contended that the appraisals of farm lands were too high, that the farmers were especially hard hit by the collapse of prices, and that the average money value of farm lands at that time was less than 50 per cent of the assessments made at the time of revaluation. The demands were for a reduction of the assessments, an extension of time until July 1, 1921 in which farmers could pay their 1920 taxes, and that all crops held by farmers on May 1, 1921 be exempted from taxation.

There were many other complaints against the assessments, and many demands for revision, and in response to this agitation the Assembly enacted a measure allowing the county commissioners to meet on the first Tuesday of April,

1921 to consider the property values in their respective counties. If the assessed values were found to be too high, the excess of such over the true values was to be reported to the Tax Commission not later than April 20th. Unless the Commission objected to the action of the county commissioners, the excesses reported by the latter were to be deducted from the valuations. Also, the penalty for delay in the payment of taxes was repealed, in so far as it applied to 1920 taxes. The county commissioners met at the time named and in a great majority of cases reductions ranging from 10 per cent to 60 per cent were ordered. The most common reductions were 25 per cent and 33 1/3 per cent. As a result of these reductions the total value of taxable property decreased from \$3,156,243,202 in 1920 to \$2,579,772,023 in 1921.

Thus was the revaluation reform defeated, not so much by the actual reduction of the values as by the change in the methods of assessing. The assessing machinery for revaluation had been highly centralized, and had had some expert advice and some few guiding principles. Now the assessments were to be made, or altered, by the commissioners of each county, with practically no centralized control, and with no rules to guide them in their assessments. It was the old time-worn system that had always proved faulty and unsatisfactory.

THE TAX LAWS

The most important change in the tax laws since 1920 has been the abolition of the property tax for central state purposes in 1921. Since that time the State has collected no tax from property or polls for the use of the State. There have been many efforts to have this tax restored, but all have been unsuccessful. In this respect North Carolina has taken its place among the most progressive states of the Union, and has shown that it is possible for a state not only to function without a property or poll tax, but also to start and carry through the greatest program of expansion and development in its history without them.

To the income tax was left a large part of the burden formerly borne by the property tax, and the rates of this tax have been raised twice since 1920. Following the constitutional amendments which allowed all incomes to be taxed, the Assembly of 1921 fixed rates from 1 per cent to 3 per cent in five groups of incomes below \$10,000. The 3 per cent rate applied to all incomes above the \$10,000 and to all corporate incomes. In 1925 there was a sharp advance in all taxes, and the income tax received its share of the burden. The new rates are from $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on five groups of incomes less than \$15,000; above that amount the rate is 5 per cent. On corporate incomes the rate was 4 per cent until it was raised to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1927.

The inclusion of all incomes under the income tax in 1920 opened up a great field of revenue, and in 1922, the first year in which the new rates were effective, there was an increase of more than two million dollars in the receipts. Those receipts were in 1926 almost twelve times as large as in 1920, being \$6,054,757, which was about 46 per cent of the General Fund receipts.

In the inheritance tax law previous to 1925 the maximum rates for the three classes of beneficiaries had been 5 per cent, 7 per cent, and 9 per cent respectively. These were increased in 1925 to 6 per cent, 12 per cent, and 16 per cent, with higher rates on all sizes of estates, and especially on those going to beneficiaries in the third class. The exemptions allowed are of the ordinary kind and are fairly generous, including all estate and inheritance taxes paid to other governments, costs of administration, fees, etc. There were some slight changes in 1927, made in order to bring the law into conformity with the Federal estate tax laws and allow the citizens of North Carolina to claim the exemption of state taxes allowed in those laws.

It is hard to make an accurate comparison of inheritance tax returns due to the naturally wide fluctuations from year to year. But it would seem, on the surface, that the rate increases of 1925 have not produced the increased revenue that

should have been expected. The receipts for 1926 were \$843,459—an increase of less than \$70,000 over 1925.

In schedule B of the revenue act, dealing with license taxes, there were many important changes and advances in 1925. Many new taxes were added and all rates were raised—practically all were at least doubled, and some trebled. Probably the most important single tax was that on the manufacturers of cigarettes. These manufacturers were grouped according to output into fourteen classes instead of three, and the highest tax was placed at \$7,500 instead of \$2,000, as formerly. An interesting tax in this schedule, levied for the first time in 1925, is one of \$2 on all indictments or proceedings finally disposed of in the superior courts, to be paid by the party convicted or adjudged to pay, except that a county shall never be required to pay. Following these increases the receipts from the taxes of this schedule more than doubled, amounting to \$1,123,662 in 1926.

In schedule C, dealing with privilege and franchise taxes, there were several increases both in 1921 and in 1925. Some of the changes made in 1925 were: the privilege tax on railroads was raised from one-tenth per cent to one-fifth per cent of the value of the property on which taxes were paid; a new tax of one per cent was levied on all public service companies not otherwise taxed; and the rates on express, telephone, telegraph and sleeping car companies were all increased. These changes caused an increase of about fifty per cent in the revenue from this schedule, and in 1926 it amounted to \$1,625,577.

The taxes just named above—the income and inheritance taxes, and the license, privilege and franchise taxes of the schedules B and C—now furnish by far the greater part of the General Fund revenues of North Carolina. The State has covered the loss of the property tax and has met its greatly increased expenditures by sharply increasing the number and the rates of other taxes. Whether further increases of expenditure can be met in this way is another question. The license taxes are so numerous and so high

that they are becoming a serious nuisance. The whole tax plan is becoming cumbersome and unwieldy, requiring more than 100 printed pages for publication.

Among the special taxes the automobile and gasoline taxes are the only important ones. In 1921 the automobile tax was increased so that the rates are from \$12.50 to \$40 per car, according to the horsepower of the engine. The rates on trucks are from \$12.50 to \$300, according to capacity. The increase in the revenue from this source has been steady and rapid, rising from \$2,145,397 in 1920 to \$7,033,003 in 1926.

In 1921, for the first time, a tax of 1 cent per gallon was levied on all fuel for motor vehicles. This tax is paid by the retail dealers, who report each month on the amount sold. They are allowed to recover the tax paid on any fuel that is not used in motor vehicles that travel on the highways. In 1923 this tax was raised to 3 cents, and, in 1925, to 4 cents. The growth of the revenue from this tax has been spectacular, rising from \$838,725 in 1922 to \$7,346,890 in 1926. Both the automobile and gasoline taxes go to the Highway Commission to make up the Highway Maintenance Fund, which is used to maintain and repair the State highways. These two taxes are the most productive and the most easily collected of any imposed. The only precaution to be observed is that these sources shall not be overworked and made to bear an undue part of the tax burden, just because they are productive.

For the year 1926 the General Fund revenue receipts were \$13,050,780, and special revenue receipts were \$16,045,112. This made a total of revenue receipts for all purposes of \$29,095,892.

ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION OF TAXES

When the property tax for state purposes was relinquished in 1921, the problem of assessment and equalization lost much of its importance as a state matter. Since the assessments are used as the basis of local taxation only, one county is not affected by a high or low assessment in another

county. However, the State still prescribes the method and machinery for the assessments. In each county there is a supervisor appointed by the county commissioners. The county auditor, tax clerk, or similar official, if there be such an official employed for full time in the county, must act as supervisor. This supervisor appoints one or more list-takers in each township to list personal property, and, every fourth year, appoints assessors to assess the real property.

In 1921 the Tax Commission was abolished and its duties and powers were transferred to a Department of Revenue, which was created at that time. Since then the State Board of Assessments has been created, and it now has the assessing and equalizing functions that formerly belonged to the Tax Commission. This Board issues pamphlets of instructions to the assessors, and the county supervisors and assessors work under the control and supervision of the Board. In practice, state control and supervision are of little importance, and each county makes its own assessments very much in its own way.

The collection of taxes has been centralized under the Department of Revenue, which now collects all state taxes. Formerly a large part of these were collected by county tax collectors and sheriffs. When the Department was created in 1921 it was given the duty of collecting all taxes which were then payable to the State Treasurer. In 1925 the duties of the Insurance Department in collecting taxes and fees, and the duties of the Secretary of State in collecting all automobile taxes and license fees, were transferred to this Department. There were complaints and protests from members of the Motor Vehicle Bureau at the time of this transfer, due to the lower salaries for officials under the new system established by the Department of Revenue. Since the change there has been much confusion and delay by this Bureau in getting out automobile license plates. Recently there has been an improvement, due to better organization of the work. With the recent transfer of the licensing date to January 1st, throwing it into the midst of the holiday season, and cutting off much of the extra help that has formerly been

employed during the rush period, further trouble may be expected. On the whole, however, the Department of Revenue has been efficient and successful. It has centralized and systematized the collection of taxes, and has relieved the Treasury Department of the whole burden of collection.

Another aid in the collecting and controlling of state funds was provided in 1925, when an act was passed requiring all persons or agencies collecting or receiving funds or money of the State to make daily deposits of the same in some bank selected by the State Treasurer, and to report the amount and nature of the funds deposited to him.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STATE FUNDS

Since 1920 there have been probably more changes and improvements in administration than in any other aspect of the State's financial policy. First, in 1921 the fiscal year was changed so as to end on June 30th, instead of November 30th, as formerly. At the same time the accounting system was changed from a cash to an accrual basis. On the cash basis, only actual cash receipts and disbursements are recorded, while on the accrual basis debits and credits are given in advance for certain receipts and disbursements that come at regular intervals and which really belong to the period preceding the one in which they come. For example, the income taxes for the year 1921 were not due until March 15, 1922. Under a cash system no record of these taxes would be made until they were paid, but under the accrual system the amount of the taxes is carefully estimated and each month during 1921 one-twelfth of the total is counted as receipts. The same plan also applies to disbursements. These changes were necessary in 1921 because, beginning in that year, the State received the greater part of its General Fund revenue from income and license taxes which were not collected until the year after they were earned. Without the accrual system the State would have had to either borrow money for current expenses or incur a large deficit. The one serious fault of the system is that it encourages liberal spending, for it is always

easy to imagine that future revenues will be larger than those of the present.

In 1923 a controversy arose between Governor Morrison and Mr. A. J. Maxwell, a member of the Corporation Commission and an authority on tax and financial matters in North Carolina. The question at issue was whether there was a deficit or a surplus in the State Treasury. Governor Morrison, in pushing the great educational and highway building program, urged liberal appropriations, claiming that there was in the Treasury a surplus of about \$2,500,000 above all charges. This was calculated, if at all, on an accrual basis. Mr. Maxwell said that instead of a surplus there was a deficit in the Treasury and that, on a cash basis, that deficit would amount to \$5,000,000. A legislative investigating committee was appointed, and after a preliminary investigation it engaged an auditing firm to make a complete audit of the Treasurer's and Auditor's books for the period Dec. 1, 1920 to Dec. 31, 1922, which was the period under discussion. After several months of work the auditors published their report, which showed that Mr. Maxwell was right, and that on a cash basis there had been, on Dec. 31, 1922, a deficit of \$5,132,087, and that on an accrual basis there was a deficit of \$477,195.

Included in the report of the auditors were some criticisms of the facilities and methods used in the Auditor's and Treasurer's departments and recommendations for changes. Among those recommendations were suggestions for a new and complete system of accounting for the Auditor's Department, a clearer division of work between the Auditor and Treasurer, the elimination of special accounts, and the daily deposit of funds by collectors. The old accounting system was inadequate, inefficient, and confusing; the reports were little more than a jumbled mass of figures and names, of which no one could make any satisfactory analysis. This old system was breaking down under the strain of the State's greatly increased financial activity. Some few changes had been made in 1922, but they did not reach far enough.

Most of the suggestions made by the auditors were followed, and since 1923 North Carolina has had a very much better accounting system and better financial reports. However, there is need of further improvement, especially in the simplification of the reports so that they may be understood by some others than expert accountants. The Auditor's reports give a fairly clear and simple statement of expenditures, and an explanation of how these expenditures were financed. But nowhere can there be found a clear, summary statement of the total of actual receipts—the very thing that should be known. Instead, there is a statement showing revenue receipts, and then a great mass of non-revenue receipts, this latter covering permanent loans, temporary loans and notes—notes made and renewed, probably several times, during the year,—refunds, the turnover of revolving funds, etc. In 1926 these non-revenue receipts reached the immense total of some \$92,000,000. Under such conditions it is practicably impossible for anyone to say how much money North Carolina actually receives during any one year. There should be a clear and simple statement of receipts showing revenues, borrowings (less refunding issues), refunds, revolving fund transactions, and any other important sources of revenue.

The next great change was the introduction of a strong executive budget system by Governor McLean in 1925. There had been a budget system for several years, but it was not a strong one and, because of Governor Morrison's opposition to it, it had not been effective. After a hard fight in the General Assembly, Governor McLean succeeded in getting a strong budget bill passed. The budget covers all state departments, institutions, and agencies, except the Highway Commission. It is administered by the Governor, who is ex-officio Director of the Budget and Head of the Budget Bureau, and an Advisory Budget Commission composed of the Chairman of the appropriations and finance committees of the House and the Senate, and two others appointed by the Governor.² Before September 1 of each even year each State

² For detailed provisions of the Budget Act, see *Public Laws of N. C.*, 1925, p. 97.

institution submits to the Budget Commission data and estimates on past, present, and future finances. The State Auditor submits a statement showing the balance to the credit of each appropriation, the quarterly and annual expenditures and revenues for each appropriation, and a financial balance sheet. The Commission then meets, considers all estimates, holds hearings on them, and makes up the budget. This budget must show: an itemized plan of all expenses for each institution or department according to the classification, estimated revenues and borrowings for the next two years, and, for each item, the amount spent during the two previous years, the amount proposed for the next two, and the increase or decrease of the proposed amount over the amount for the two previous years. One thousand copies of this budget are printed and distributed to all institutions concerned and to members of the Assembly.

The Commission also makes up an appropriation bill and a revenue bill, which are introduced into both houses by members of the Commission. The Assembly may reduce or strike out any item of the appropriation bill, but it may not consider further or make special appropriations until the Budget bill has passed, unless the Governor submits an emergency bill and appropriations so made end when the Budget bill becomes effective. If any appropriation is raised, the revenue act must be amended to provide sufficient revenue for the increase. If any further appropriation is passed it shall be for a single object, and must provide adequate revenue for the appropriation unless the budget shows that there will be sufficient funds for it in the General Fund.

The essential feature of this budget system is the great power and control given to the Governor as Director. Under the act his duties are: to recommend changes in departments and institutions, to supervise the work of the Budget Commission, and to present the budget to the Assembly with a budget message, a financial statement of general and special funds, and a statement of the condition of the Treasury. The same act gives him powers in proportion to his duties. He approves and controls all allotments of appropriations to

all departments and institutions. If such are not spent as prescribed, he can withhold further allotments. He can make changes in the accounting system of any agency or order an audit of the books at any time. In the case of a disagreement between him and the Commission in the preparation of the budget, report, or any bill, he can write in his opinion, with a note stating the opinion of the dissenting members. Also, under the appropriation bill of 1925, he is given power to reduce pro rata all appropriations, if he thinks that there will not be sufficient revenue to meet them. This appropriation act further helped to make possible a balanced budget by repealing practically all of the scattered appropriations then in effect, by providing that unspent appropriations should lapse at the end of the period for which they were made, and that any excess of revenue over appropriations should be divided between the Veterans' Pensions and the Public School Equalization Fund.

This budget system, which went into effect July 1, 1925, has met with almost universal approval and has worked well in practice. During the first year of its operation the Governor exercised the power conferred in the appropriation bill and made a 5 per cent reduction on all appropriations. However, this was not really necessary for the cut amounted to only \$354,000, while the year ended with a cash surplus of well over a million dollars.

At the time the budget system was adopted, Governor McLean insisted also that the State should go back to a cash basis of accounting. To do this it was necessary to provide some means of paying off the cash debit carried on the books at that time and thus get an even start. This was done by authorizing the Treasurer to issue General Fund notes to the amount of the debit, which was \$9,438,331.61. These notes were issued in serial form, maturing from July, 1926 to July, 1935, so that the total balance is being amortized at the rate of about \$1,000,000 per annum. The total of the debit balance included a deficit of over \$3,000,000 and advanced debits made in anticipation of future revenues to the extent of over \$6,000,000.

Not covered by the budget is the Highway Commission, which administers a large sum of the State's money. The powers of this Commission were greatly increased in 1921: it was given the control of 5,500 miles of road, and was directed to start on a county-seat-to-county-seat hard surface road-building program. The Commission is entirely separate from the general financial system of the State. The Highway Fund is deposited with the State Treasurer, and payments are made from it only on vouchers drawn by the Commission. This Fund is composed of the Maintenance Fund, already explained, and the Construction Fund which comes from the sale of bonds, and is used entirely in the construction of new highways. All interest and sinking funds to cover these bonds are provided from the Maintenance Fund. At present there are \$105,000,000 in Highway bonds outstanding, all of them serial in form, and maturing in from four to forty years.

Another important agency is the Sinking Fund Commission, created in 1925. It is composed of the State Treasurer, as chairman, the Governor, and the State Auditor; and its purpose is to administer and invest all sinking funds according to strict rules provided by law, and to enforce the provision of Article II, Section 30 of the Constitution, adopted in 1924, which prohibits the General Assembly from using any sinking fund money for any purpose other than the retirement of the bonds for which the fund was created.

DISBURSEMENTS

In the matter of disbursements growth has been from \$13,027,177 in 1920 to \$40,039,713 in 1926. A comparison of some of the principal items for the two years is as follows:

	1920	1926
Highways	\$1,845,000	\$20,276,928
Educational institutions	1,647,881	6,469,719
Public schools	3,381,838	1,900,000
Interest on debt	462,573	5,567,878*
Institutions for care of the defective, delinquent and dependent	1,773,522	2,517,269

* These figures cover interest on all bonds—General Fund, School Construction, Highway, etc.

The reason for the decline in the amount spent on public schools is that the State temporarily had to bear a large part of the increase in the expenses of the public schools following the adoption in 1918 of the constitutional requirement of a six month's school term, but as conditions became adjusted to the longer term the counties have assumed their old share of the expenses. However, the State will soon assume again a large part of this expense, for the 1927 Assembly appropriated \$3,250,000 for the Public School Equalization Fund, and the indications are that this will be increased in the future.

THE DEBT

The State debt has had a spectacular growth in the past few years. Starting from \$11,513,400 in 1920, it had risen to \$144,065,600 by June 30, 1926, an increase of 1,151%. The important bond issues of the period, including those authorized in 1927, have been: for highways, \$115,000,000; for permanent improvements, \$27,748,500; to pay deficits, \$11,500,000; to provide a special school building fund to be loaned to counties, \$12,500,000; to establish a loan fund to help World War Veterans to buy homes, \$2,000,000; to establish a National Park in the mountain region of North Carolina, \$2,000,000. The State provides a Special School Building Fund to be loaned to counties because, due to its wider credit, it can borrow money at a lower rate than can the counties. The money is loaned at the same rate at which it is borrowed. Loans are made from the Veterans' Loan Fund to the World War veterans at six per cent interest to assist in buying homes. No loan may exceed \$3,000 or 75 per cent of the value of the real estate offered as security. All loans and the interest on them are to be repaid in 20 annual or 40 semi-annual installments.

In order to provide some means of controlling the debt, Article V, Section 4, of the Constitution was amended in 1924 by a vote of the people so as to set a limit beyond which the debt might not go. That amendment provides that except

for refunding a valid debt, supplying a casual deficit, or suppressing an invasion or insurrection, no new debt may be incurred by the State if such will make the aggregate debt, less sinking funds on hand and railroad and other stocks owned by the State, more than $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the assessed valuation of all taxable property as last listed for taxation. Calculated according to this formula, the limit to the debt on January 1, 1927 was approximately \$216,000,000.

CONCLUSION

It has indeed been a huge and unparalleled expansion in the State's finances that has taken place during the past six years. However, it would seem that we have passed the peak in this great and ambitious program of development. Expenditures dropped from \$46,573,652 in 1925 to \$40,039,713 in 1926, and the expenditures for state institutions were materially reduced by the 1927 Assembly. When the proceeds from the \$30,000,000 highway bond issue authorized in 1927 have been spent, the initial program of road building will be practically completed. Anyway, necessity will soon force a halt, for soon we will be nearing the constitutional limit to the debt, and the volume of the financial activities without bond issues will be very much smaller than now. However, when the program of development and expansion is completed the volume of the State's fiscal transactions will remain several times larger than before 1920, due to the necessity of meeting interest and sinking fund requirements, and of paying off the serial bonds, which will begin to fall due in large quantities about 1931 or 1932. Also, there will have to be larger appropriations for maintaining the greatly enlarged state institutions. So, while we have passed the peak in regard to the amount of money handled, it is well to remember that a large part of the money handled during the past six years has been borrowed; so far as actual revenues are concerned there has not been, nor can there be soon, any decline. There is no relief in sight for the taxpayer unless it be through a more equitable distribution of the tax load. The State has greatly increased its activities and has assumed a great load of bonds, and this increased burden must be borne.

STATE CONTROL OF EDUCATION

EDGAR W. KNIGHT

University of North Carolina

THE ESSENTIAL purpose of the modern democratic state should be to formulate and follow intelligent and progressive policies for the protection, the instruction, and the training of all its people. The state should be more than an educational tax collector or tax distributor, law maker, or policeman. It should be an active and energetic social agency constantly employed for the physical, moral, intellectual, social and industrial betterment of all its members without regard to their economic or social status, or any other accidental conditions or circumstances. The rights of all citizens in their legitimate activities should be safeguarded by the state, which should always be alert to employ all its resources for the improvement of all the people and to enlarge their opportunities for personal and social development. Such a purpose as this involves, however, a great many more activities of an educational nature than those of establishing, supporting, and directing schools, though the educational purpose may best be seen in the arrangements which the state makes for schools.

To achieve this educational purpose the American States have established at one time or another some form of central administrative control of schools. Steps towards this control were first taken in the early part of the nineteenth century when provision was made for a state board of education and a chief state school officer. The general expansion of these organs of public educational administration did not come until many years after their establishment, however, and even now that expansion is clearly in process of further development. Today the office of State Superintendent or Commissioner of Schools is found in each of the forty-eight states. But the evolution of this office shows much variety in the provisions for it, in the names by which it is officially designated, in the qualifications required of those who occupy the office and in the methods of selecting them, in their tenure, in the com-

pensation which they receive, as well as in the scope of their jurisdiction and the kind and extent of their powers. Uniformity in state school administration is unknown in the United States.

This absence of uniformity in central state educational control has been due to its haphazard development. This development also has been due in large part to rather definite influences. One of these was the theory of individual and local community rights, which so long prevailed because it met with such wide popular approval. This theory was in close harmony with the democratic theory of government which included local self-government by small units, where interests were narrow and provincial. Moreover, it was quite natural that Americans should remember their troubles with England and the war which they waged for independence. They learned to distrust centralization of power in any form or for any purpose, because it denoted autocracy and tyranny, which they taught themselves and their children to despise and resist.

Another influence caused slow and haphazard development of state educational control. The constitution of the United States, by implication in the tenth amendment, had delegated the obligation of education to the various states. But this obligation was not directly placed upon the states, and these moved slowly to assume it. The public utterances of the leading statesmen of the early national period, the messages of governors, who urged often in very general and sometimes pious terms that legislatures provide for schools, did not move the states promptly to set up the means of education at public expense. Even Jefferson's significant bill in the legislature of Virginia in 1779, "for the more general diffusion of knowledge," failed to pass that body or to influence public opinion widely in that state. Education was viewed then and for many years afterwards in all parts of the United States, not as a duty and function of government but as one of a church, or as a parental or family obligation. In the early national period it was not even accepted as a function of small local units of government, not to mention the central state govern-

ment. The states were not required to make provision for it. The Continental Congress, as early as May 1776, had recommended to the various states the adoption of "such government as shall, in the opinion of the representatives of the people, best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular and America in general." Following this recommendation all the states except Connecticut and Rhode Island, which regarded their colonial charters adequate to the changed conditions, framed and adopted constitutions. But not all of them made constitutional provision for schools, and the lawmaking bodies in many of the states which did adopt such constitutional provisions did not immediately or strictly observe the mandates. The states did not provide for public education until the people themselves began to feel and make vocal the need for schools and until they also developed a willingness, which at first appeared quite half-hearted, to pay for schools.

Still another influence which delayed the growth of centralization in education and made for decentralization was the long traditional and historical association of schools with the church or with other religious and philanthropic organizations, or other forms of private educational effort. Elementary schools were established primarily for religious purposes. It was natural, therefore, that the idea of public control of education should be slow to appear and develop in a community not accustomed to public support of schools. Devotion to the democratic doctrine of localism, the influence of the theory that the support or the control of education was not properly a function of government, and the silence of the federal constitution on the subject of schools made for decentralization in educational work, and delayed the beginnings of state control of local schools.

Moreover, there was no American model for the office of state superintendent of schools, nor were serious suggestions for such an office made during the early national period. Local city and county superintendencies were not known until the creation of the state superintendency, and the office of the United States Commissioner of Education was not established

until after the Civil War. The chief state school office could not come into being until the need appeared for supervision or oversight of state funds for schools.

The initial step in the movement to secure such oversight was taken, therefore, when the states began to give financial aid to local schools. Funds then as now were the whiphand in compelling local communities to submit to state supervision. It was this force which guided or drove communities along the slow and toilsome road from excessive faith in localism and false standards in education to toleration for centralization in the state department of education. It was this same whiphand, also, which directed public opinion to the view, now generally accepted in the United States, that education is a function for the state to perform, and that schools and other means of instruction and training should be maintained and directed under the supervision of the state. This has come to be a fundamental principle of education in a democracy. The principle began to take form when the state first offered to give aid to local schools on condition that they conform to certain state requirements. This arrangement between the state and smaller administrative units marks also the origin of local distrust and resentment, and often of open hostility, toward the power of central state control, which has been gaining strength increasingly in recent years.

After the need for schools came to be generally recognized, but before there had developed a willingness to pay for them by public taxation, the most perplexing educational problem in this country was to secure funds for school support. Permanent public school funds or endowments seemed to be the solution. It was believed that such funds would make the schools free and available to all and, what was an even more attractive promise, relieve the people of direct taxation for education. Arrangements for indirect school support were likely to be popular at a time when schools were not generally considered an obligation of the state and when taxes were not looked upon with high favor even for the pressing necessities of government, such as the administration of justice, poor relief, the maintenance of jails, courthouses and defense.

Schools were not considered necessary expenses of government.

The inability of a permanent public school fund to provide educational facilities without taxation or other means of support was quite promptly demonstrated in the case of Connecticut, which established such a fund in 1795. The experiment was costly and disappointing, and the result probably retarded education for many years and increased the necessity for "rate bills," which were not eliminated in that state until 1868. New York was able to profit by the mistake of Connecticut and to view the fund established in 1805 as a means not of relieving the people of local school burdens, but of encouraging local taxation for education. This principle of state aid for those communities which would help themselves has come to be accepted throughout the country as quite sound and stimulating.

New York was the first state to create an office to exercise central educational supervision. As early as 1784 the legislature established the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York for the purpose of creating, endowing, and controlling secondary and higher education. Specific needs for some degree of control in elementary education appeared in that state when it became necessary to distribute safely to local community schools the income from the permanent school endowment established in 1805. Between 1795 and 1800, under experimental school legislation, annual state grants had been made for schools. The funds were distributed to localities which raised by taxation one-half of the amounts given by the state. The absence of general direction by some central authority and the lack of cohesive power in the plan led to its failure. There was waste of money intended for educational purposes. The schools seem to have commanded no respect because they exerted no influence and in 1800 the legislature refused to renew the appropriation. The plan collapsed and was not revived until 1812.

By that time it had become evident that any aid which the state gave to schools must be supervised in some manner to prevent a waste of funds and moral injury to the communi-

ties which had shown tendencies to escape their educational responsibilities. Central supervision in some form was necessary and it was believed that this could best be exercised by some officer who represented the state. The officer could also collect information which the legislature, in view of the slowly increasing recognition of the place of the state in providing education, was beginning now to require. A knowledge of conditions among the people and of their educational desires was necessary, also, if intelligent and progressive school laws were to be enacted. This officer could furnish this knowledge, in part at least, and he could also stimulate educational interest among the people. To control the funds, to gather information, and to encourage educational interest were the purposes of the first state superintendency in the United States, but the greatest of these probably was to control the funds.

The office was a new one for this country. It was native in origin and apparently influenced little, if any, by practices in other countries. The statute of the New York legislature of 1812 designated the officer as "the Superintendent of Common Schools," who was to be appointed by the "Council of Appointment," which consisted of four senators, one from each district, to be chosen by the legislature. His salary was to be \$300 a year but he was "not to be under pay until he shall give notice of the first distribution of school money." His duty was to digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the common school fund and for the better organization of the common schools, to prepare and report estimates and expenditures of the school moneys, to superintend the collection thereof, to direct the sale of the public lands which had been or would be appropriated as a permanent public school fund, to prepare and provide the legislature with information concerning education, and "perform all such services relative to the welfare of the schools as he shall be directed to perform." As evidence of good faith the officer was by this act also required to take an oath or affirmation to execute his trust diligently and faithfully.

The act of 1812 followed a report of a legislative committee on "a system for the organization and establishment of

common schools," and is one of the important educational documents in the history of New York. The committee evidently had given some rather careful study to the plans followed in other countries. In addition to the recognition of the principle of state control and provision for school district organization, the act of 1812 also contains other interesting educational ideas. It declared that all teachers should possess moral character and certain scholastic qualifications which were to be determined by local school officers. The principle of permissive taxation in local communities was established for the purpose of providing schoolhouses and to furnish and repair the buildings. Local school officers were authorized to employ teachers and fix their compensation. The act accepted in part the principle that public education is a function of the state and that it should be provided and maintained under the supervision of the state; that in order for the state to meet its educational obligation a system of publicly supported schools should be established and local officers should execute the educational policy of the state. The act also reflects the principle that state supervision naturally follows state support of education.

Gideon Hawley was the first appointee to the Superintendency, in January, 1813. His vigorous activity in behalf of public schools later offended the politicians, however, whose behavior resembled that of offended politicians today; and in 1821 they removed him. They also abolished the office and designated the secretary of state to act, *ex officio*, as Superintendent of the Common Schools, and this continued to be the status of the matter in New York until 1854. In that year the office was re-created as a separate one, this time, however, under the official designation "Superintendent of Public Instruction," a title which by that time had become more or less general in the United States. In 1904 the title was changed to "Commissioner of Education," which today is the official designation of the chief state school officer in New York.

Maryland in 1826 created the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. But the office seems to have been abolished

two years later, not to be reestablished until 1864. Michigan, while a territory, in 1829, Louisiana in 1833, Tennessee in 1836, Ohio and Massachusetts in 1837, and Kentucky in 1838 provided for the office. Gradually the other states followed, and by 1850 a chief state school officer was found in thirty-one states and three territories. By 1875 the office had become generally accepted throughout the country. Today it is permanently established in each of the forty-eight states.

The length of the term of the chief state school officer varies from one year to six years, but the four-year term is found in twenty-four states and the two-year term in fourteen states. Generally, the term is fixed by constitution or by statute. The tendency today is towards a longer term than formerly. It is believed that a long and fixed term has the advantage of protection from political interference. During such a term a Superintendent of strength and professional fitness has the opportunity of formulating and executing constructive educational policies. On the other hand, it is difficult to remove a weak and professionally unfit Superintendent before the expiration of a long and fixed term for which he is chosen. The absence of legal means to dispose of such an official might become a real obstacle to educational progress. In New York, New Hampshire, and Vermont the chief state school officer serves during the pleasure of the State Board of Education, which regularly appoints him for an indefinite term.

The salary of the chief state school officer is one measure of the state's conception of the importance of the office and perhaps also a measure of the strength and leadership of those who occupy the office. Low salaries were generally the rule in the early history of the state superintendency, and this rule prevailed until comparatively recent years. In 1896, for example, the largest salary paid to this office was \$5,000 in New York. Massachusetts paid \$4,500, but Michigan paid only \$1,000. The average salary paid in that year to the chief state school officers of the United States was less than \$2,500. In 1909 the average salary had been increased to about \$2,700, with many of the states paying, however, only about \$2,000. Today the salaries range from \$2,000 to \$12,000, with the average a little better than \$4,000.

Although the chief state school officer is the nominal head of the state school system, in many states his salary is less than that of many other educational workers. Presidents of state universities and colleges and of state normal schools often receive larger salaries than the Superintendent or Commissioner of Education. And practically all the states have one or more city superintendents whose salaries are greater. It was recently pointed out, moreover, that in some states the salary of this official is less than that paid school principals and elementary and high school teachers. It is significant that the lowest salaries paid the chief state school officer are found generally in those states which elect him by popular vote and the highest salaries in those states where he is appointed. In the states where he is elected by popular vote the average salary is a little more than half of that which is paid him in states where the method of selection is by appointment.

It is perhaps significant that nearly a score of titles have been used to designate the chief state school officer in the United States since the office was first established more than a century ago. In the early days there was indifference toward the value of the office and later enlarged public conceptions of its importance developed. Today the office is designated by about a half-dozen titles. The West and the South seem to prefer "Superintendent of Public Instruction"; "Commissioner of Education" is found widely used in the North and East; and the tendency in recent years has been to adopt this latter title whenever changes are made. Massachusetts adopted it in 1909, New Jersey in 1911, Vermont in 1915, New Hampshire and Minnesota in 1919, Rhode Island in 1920, Connecticut in 1921, and Maine and Tennessee in 1923. About two-thirds of the states make constitutional provisions for the office, and the remainder provide for it by statutes.

Seventeen of the states prescribe no qualifications whatever for those who hold the office of State Superintendent or Commissioner of Education. In such states the office is open, in theory at any rate, to any respectable citizen irre-

spective of educational qualifications. Some of the states specify certain requirements as to age and residence, such as would generally have to be met by state officers who are elected by popular vote. Rather general educational qualifications are required in some of the states, such as graduation from a standard college or experience in teaching and school administration. In most of the states the office has been held by men. Recently, however, it has been held by women, especially in some of the western states where interest in woman suffrage appeared early and perhaps received its greatest support. In no eastern or southeastern state has a woman served as the chief state school officer, but in many of the western states she has been found in that position.

During the early years the duties of the chief state school officer were not numerous. For the most part they were statistical, clerical, exhortatory and advisory. He was expected to look after the state school funds and see that they were properly apportioned to those local communities which met the requirements for state aid; to make statistical reports to the legislature or the state board of education; to visit various parts of the state and by public speeches or conferences with the people encourage interest in schools. Today, however, his duties are numerous and his powers generally are quite large. In the selection of textbooks, organization of courses of study, and the formulation of policies of school finance; in the training and certification of teachers and accrediting high schools and colleges; in initiating school legislation and even in the interpretation of the school laws; in determining standards for school buildings, child-welfare work, school library extensions, adult and vocational education, and in a host of other matters that are vital in a modern school system, he may and often does have large powers and influence. The increased duties of this office indicate the change from localism to centralization in public education.

This change indicates also the enlarged popular conception of the importance of public education, and the emphasis which more and more is being placed upon public educational leadership and expert direction. Theoretically an improved type

of intelligent and professional direction is required as much in public education as in modern highway engineering, health and sanitation work, agriculture, and other activities of modern state governments. The State Superintendent or Commissioner of Schools must be a professional leader. The need is no longer for a clerk, a politician, or a professor and lecturer at large. The public educational needs of a modern state require that its chief school officer be equipped with a high order of business and executive ability, professional consciousness, a keen sense of public educational duty, generous scholarship, broad vision of the social needs of the state he is serving, apostolic fervor and unselfishness, and even a quiet willingness to be forgotten. No other state officer occupies so important and strategic a place for moral and social leadership as the Superintendent of Public Schools.

The best theories of the importance of the chief state school officer, however, are not practically applied. This fact is revealed especially in the method most commonly used for selecting this official. Since the creation of the office in New York in 1812 at least a half dozen methods of filling it have been used. Today three methods are in common use: appointment by the governor, appointment by the state board of education, and election by popular vote. Although the method recognized as best by authorities on public school administration is that of appointment by a properly constituted board of educational control, about three-fourths of the states use the political method of popular election, which is prescribed by the constitutions or statutes of those states.

Viewed in the light of the best educational experience and the soundest principle of educational administration, this method of selecting the chief state school officer limits his effectiveness and influence. Election by this method is generally on the basis of partisan nomination and it binds the officer to party pledges and often identifies him with active party politics. The duties of a State Superintendent of Schools require a training and fitness, and also professional qualities, which are rarely at home with those qualities which

generally commend men to the political leaders and bosses. Moreover, election by popular vote limits the choice to citizens of the state. This method has been discarded as vicious in the selection of all the newer experts. Chairmen of highway commissions, highway engineers, and heads of state boards of health are not chosen by popular vote. No city would select its Superintendent of Schools by such means. No state would select the president of its university or of one of its colleges by popular vote. The argument that many states still select their chief state school officers by this method is not sound, and the argument that this method keeps the schools close to the people is likewise unsound. The important thing is to keep the people close to the schools, which is a very different matter.

The initial statute creating the first State Superintendent in the United States prescribed the duties of that office. He was required "to digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the common school fund, and for the better organization of common schools; to prepare and report estimates and expenditures of the school monies, to superintend the collection thereof, to execute such services relative to the sale of the lands, which now are or hereafter may be appropriated, as a permanent fund for the support of common schools, as may be by law required of him; to give information to the legislature respecting all matters referred to him by either branch thereof, or which shall appertain to his office; and generally to perform all such services relative to the welfare of schools, as he shall be directed to perform, and shall, prior to his entering upon the duties of his office, take an oath or affirmation for the diligent and faithful execution of his trust."

These general and somewhat vague duties stand out in rather sharp contrast to those found in the legislation covering the duties of this officer in New York and perhaps other American states today. The absence of specific powers then is in even greater contrast to the large and definite powers with which the office is now clothed in many states. This increase in centralized authority in education represents

the gradual change from the theory of localism and other extreme educational applications of democracy, to the theory of centralization. One example may serve to illustrate.

Judge Chester B. McLaughlin, of the Court of Appeals of New York State, in an opinion handed down in July, 1926, held that State Commissioner of Education Frank P. Graves was within his official rights when he directed the board of education of Union School, District Number Two, Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County, to raise by tax levy sufficient funds to provide for the transportation of children of school age who lived so far from the school that they could not otherwise attend. The order of Commissioner Graves was given in March, 1924, after he had made an investigation, but the local school board, instead of obeying the order, referred the case to the people of the school district who voted against the tax.

The opinion of Judge McLaughlin is significant in the educational history of New York and of the United States. It shows both the increased powers of the chief state school officer and the enlarged public respect for the educational interests and rights of children. The opinion noted that the law permitted the formation of small schools into a larger or "union free school district", and when such a district was formed its board of education was given sufficient power to provide equal educational advantages for all the children of the district. If the board should neglect to make such provision or should neglect or refuse "to carry out the object for which the district has been formed", the chief state school officer has in the school law of the state sufficient authority to compel action. The decision is an illustration of localism yielding to centralization, of alleged local rights surrendering to central power, not in the interest of tyranny and despotism, however, but in behalf of the rights of the children and in the interest of general public welfare. It is another illustration, also, of the changed conception of the democratic state, whose preëminent concern should be for the protection and improvement of all its citizens.

THE NEGRO IN RECENT SOUTHERN LITERATURE

HAROLD P. MARLEY

Toledo, Ohio

THERE is a new approach to the Negro in the literature of the South today. We can best understand what it is by briefly considering the old approach, which is adequately described by Mrs. George Madden Martin of Louisville, who is herself the pioneer of the new approach. She says: "Thomas Nelson Page and his school drew the Negro to flatter the white, and satisfy his troubled conscience. George Cable romanticized the Negro people and his interpretation brought no reaction that benefited the race in the South. Cohen holds to the old idea, the grotesque, the farcical, the Negro of the minstrel stage. This is unfair, and lowers the Negro in his own esteem, though Cohen does, however, reveal a personal life and social sense that is good to be emphasized. The new school, including Mrs. Peterkin, Mr. Heyward and myself, endeavor to look at life through the colored people's eyes and truthfully show what we see." Thus the Negro, by a complex of inner and outer circumstances, denied the privilege of a spokesman from his own ranks, has run the gauntlet of what white authors and white publishers choose to say about him.

The most significant thing about the place of these people in literature today is that they are in literature. The picture which we have of them is not at all alarming; it is just like any white picture with a dark tinge. The thing we must notice is that they are no longer playing the rôle of supporting characters to white romance and white plot, but they stand on their own feet. Instead of going into the kitchen or fields of the "big house" to find out what is going on, we move among their own communities, their own kitchens, and live with them their own sorrows and joys. It is a distinctly stimulating sensation. It is like going into a holy of holies where no Caucasian has ever trod. The best and the worst which we have suspected of the Negro from our long distance view has been substantiated, but now we know *why*.

✓

The fundamental principle of white life, its division into classes both horizontal and perpendicular, we find also to be true of Negro life. Here, too, there is a continual reacting of one class to the other, a borrowing of good and evil of one class from another, and certain fundamental things wherein all classes will act together. Heretofore the Negro has been just the one black-and-brown shaded mass. The divisions were by age and sex rather than character or "standing." The old man was "Uncle" and the old woman, "Mammy"; the young man, "Sambo," and the infant, a pickaninny. Outside of these divisions there was the "good nigger" and the "bad nigger," badness being determined often by inability to "keep ones place", and all suspected of badness until they proved themselves otherwise. In the literature of today the question is asked, "What Negro, what class, where does he live and what were his opportunities?" The generation which is writing today has grown up in a world which is rapidly losing the false concepts and standards engendered by war, a war fought between white peoples over Negro peoples. As Stribling pointed out in *Birthingright*, the writings of the older South were apologetics, they were trying to prove something, they sought to acquit the white person of deeds real or impugned.

In this paper we shall deal with the literature which has come only from those who have been born in the South and lived most of their lives in the South. This is not because the recent literature in the North has not been significant, but because it is of especial interest to know if there has been a shift in the traditional attitude of the South. Some of the authors treated in this paper are now residing in the North, but their underlying philosophy was formed before leaving the South.

There are two main divisions which the Negro race may fall into today according to the recent novels, the uneducated and the educated. As more and more Negroes go through high school, college, and the professional school, there is a growing problem which our ancestors were not called upon to answer, the problem of the place in life of the modern, edu-

cated, high thinking Negro. This problem is the one which is of outstanding prominence today in the literature of the South. But there is also a new note in the treatment of the rank and file of the Negro race. The great masses of uneducated adults are being viewed more sympathetically. Historically, *The Slave Ship*, by Mary Johnston, is an excellent modern interpretation of the woes of the Negro in the days when he was being transplanted. Miss Johnston is a Virginian and has gained a reputation through her historical novels. If she would do what W. D. Weatherford has done in his *The Negro from Africa to America*, it would popularize through fiction a neglected chapter in the life of the Negro. Such individuals as W. C. Jackson and Howard Odum are having a tremendous influence on the crop of young writers just coming to the front, but we cannot use their findings in a treatment of the literature. A statement in a recent issue of *The Journal of Social Forces* to the effect that there are a "considerable number of white strains in this country that would be greatly elevated by the infusion of some of the better blood of the Negro race," shows the attitude of this progressive group. This is not an advocacy of intermarriage, but is the reaction of the intellectual to the rot which comes from such quarters as *White America*, published by The White American Society of Richmond. This group was responsible for the passage of the Virginia Race Integrity Law, and their brilliant solution of the Negro problem is deportation to Africa. Another significant book is called *In Black and White* and is a sort of autobiography of Mrs. L. H. Hammond, a Southern woman who has been able to clear away the debris in her thinking which followed the confusion of the war and to build up a solid thesis that the solution lies in a frank mutual attack of the problems on the basis of community pride and good-will, without thought of color. It was published in 1914 and tells of the many forces at work to bring this about, such as the Southern Sociological Congress.

In 1922 came *Nigger*, by Clement Wood. It gives us a long sweep in the life of a Negro family from before the Civil War to the present. Jake, the key character of the book, in the

beginning is awakened from his sleep by bloodhounds, and, in the end, is left wondering in his senile mind about emancipation, and whether his wife who has just been buried in a Birmingham cemetery was right when she said that it would only come after death. As a young man he is lined up on the front lawn with the three hundred other slaves and informed of the great emancipation in the following terms: "Citizens of this grand and bloodily united republic, it has been made my duty to notify you that you have been freed by constitutional amendment. You are free to go where you damn please; and the sooner those of you who intend to leave get out of Dallas County, the better for them. Those of you who want to remain on the plantation will be paid for their work." Jake's emancipation brought him a wife and eventually a large group of grandchildren whom the grandparents cared for upon the death of their parents. The frightful intimidations and lynchings which followed cause the old people and grandchildren to hurry through the swamp, out of the Black Belt, and eventually to Birmingham, then the Mecca of the oppressed black man. But life in the city was hard, and the incidents which came into the lives of the young people were of a great range, according to the likes and dislikes of these individuals. Wood shows us with great skill the problems which were theirs, and with perhaps too great a range of outcomes for one family gives us the sport—both male and female—the plodder, and the brilliant embryonic professional man. In each grandchild Jake was hoping to see a realization of the coveted emancipation, but finally gave up all hope except in the great-grandchild born from his step granddaughter who passed as "white." The boy who was valedictorian of his graduating class was killed in France during the great war to "make the world safe for democracy," and the other grandson who showed promise after the broadening influences of army life, was shot while engaging in looting a freight car just on the eve of his departure for his law course in Chicago.

A more vivid portrait of the average Negro's state of existence comes to us in *Porgy*, by Dubose Heyward, in 1925.

The hero is a poor cripple who drives his goat to his favorite stand where he begs during the day, and returns at night to the court, an old converted mansion now in the heart of Niggertown, where he really lives. It is a faithful presentation of the Negro in Charleston, S. C. in the late nineties. He says of his book: "Out of these experiences, I grew to see the primitive Negro as neither a professional comedian nor an object for sentimental charity, but a racially self-conscious human being, living out his destiny beside us, and guided by a code, which, while it has as yet accepted little of the law of the white man, represented a definite upward urge." There is no propaganda in the book, only a serious attempt to show the average uneducated Negro as he is, not an ex-slave or a minstrel.

We usually think of the Negro with respect to his bread and butter problem—what we shall pay him and what he will steal to supplement this wage—but *Porgy* shows us that we have entirely missed the point. He has his love-affairs, both regular and irregular, he has his legal difficulties, enshrouded as he is by white man's law, and he has his bereavements, culminating in funerals which have a world of pathos in their very helplessness. Then, too, there is recreation. The inevitable game of ivory cubes, the boat trip on a gala holiday, and the glorious art of loitering. There is a rugged strength of character in Porgy and Maria, his neighbor, proprietress of the inn, which stands in vivid contrast to the weakness and primitive nature of Crown, his wife, and the young sport who dispensed the "happy dust" dope. We see that the sensuous desires and indulgences coming through drugs, sex and drink are no respecters of color, but demand a hearing by all alike. The old belief that the Negro was listless, which charge was no doubt due to the lack of interest shown in work of which he had no share in the returns, is dispelled by Heyward. The stevedore who swung heavy cotton bales, the man who stank from fertilizer or the fishermen who risked their lives in the ocean when the fish were "running," all knew how to work *hard* and *long*. The penetrating

powers of Porgy were known by his black neighbors and he was respected for them. His faithfulness to the woman who chose to live with him is noteworthy and pathetic when he stoops to voodooism in a last effort to save her life from sickness.

One of the most significant things about *Porgy* is not that the author has given us a picture of the Negro compartment of life, but that he has shown that it is such an air-tight compartment. He has shown that the Negro is not himself before the white person, and however much we may pride ourselves upon confidences which Negroes may bestow upon us and individual contacts we may have had, we simply are in the dark. Life at Catfish Row was as different as it could possibly be from Negro life out in the cross currents of white civilization. Not that it was immoral or basely primitive, but it was just Negro. There they were themselves. They shed their white inferiority complex the same as a man will shed his collar at the close of a hard day's work. They were themselves, not always happy as we sometimes suspect, but frequently cast down, perplexed and afraid. The minute a white man would step inside the court, a shift of expression would occur as though controlled by electricity. It was sudden and complete. However much one Negro might detest another, he would think a long time before he would be the means of handing him over to the white man's court, with white laws, white judges and white jails. It is this compartment theory of life which is so dangerous. It is unfortunate when our mind is acting this way, it is tragedy when society is living this way.

The plays of Paul Green are faithful presentations of Negro life in eastern North Carolina. Mr. Green is qualified to write of these matters, as he grew up on a farm in that locality and has never gotten out of the shadow of the problems down there, either figuratively or literally. He has not dealt with the educated Negro, because there have been few with which to deal, but he has shown us Negro rural life just as Heyward has shown us the urban side of it. There is the stifling heat of the cotton field, and the stagnate at-

mosphere of the swamp in the turpentine industry. Most of his plays are of one act only, and thus the problem presented bulks larger than the setting of the play permits. The sex motive, of both white with black and black with black, is vividly presented, the former being shown in its terrible significance for the Negro girl. In the *End of the Road* she had to lay aside her ambition for education and advancement, and *The White Dress* closes with the young woman facing the stone wall of our dual standards; the old grandmother who has just disclosed the mother's past to the girl, tells her that she knows how she feels and what her emotions are, but "you got to smother 'em in." The *No 'Count Boy* shows the quandary of the Negro girl who had to chose between her fiancé who promised wall paper for their home, and the demented "no 'count boy" who could play the harp, use nice words and promised plenty of travel, getting out of the county and seeing the world. In the *Hot Iron* the economic shoe begins to pinch when the worthless father leaves home and the children take up their tasks in the cotton field. When he returns home, the mother sufficiently cures him with a hot iron. Paul Green's greatest success came with the dramatization of his play *In Abraham's Bosom*, a full length play which is running at present at the Provincetown Playhouse in New York. It follows the plays of Eugene O'Neill, but is coming closer home in that it shows us a North Carolina Negro of about forty years ago vainly struggling to rise above his own lack of education and take his people with him. The mob scene and the causes leading up to the lynching are as clearly developed as in Wood's *Nigger*. The implication of Abraham's own son in the lynching, by his tipping off the klansmen, is hardly true to the usual picture. Most mobs act without a Judas.

There is a good deal of Negro folk-lore in recent southern literature. It is not significant for us to consider as we find nothing new about the Negro; we simply see the one side of him which we have always been prone to see, the side which the white loiterers in *Birthright* saw when they remarked that the Negro was always happy and carefree and they wished they could be that way too. R. Emmet Kennedy in

Black Cameos gives us a fine collection of this folk-lore gathered from his knowledge of the Louisiana Negro. He says in his introduction: "The untutored Negro of the South possesses this charm of inherent creative ability to an astonishing degree. He is wonderfully gifted musically, and fairly tingles with poetic tendencies; unconsciously expressing his most commonplace thought in the direct, rhythmic language of true poetry." This ancient folk-lore and the spirituals are fast dying out, for the *new* Negro considers it an element of weakness and a relic of slavery days. Unless it is recorded now before the old Negroes die, it will be lost. Professors Odum, Johnson, White, and Jackson in North Carolina and Dorothy Scarborough, as well as James Weldon Johnson, a Negro, have all helped in this preserving process. The new Negro poetry cannot be distinguished from any of the modern poetry except for such outspoken longings which creep into it, such as "caged in the circus of civilization," or "tomorrow I'll sit at the table, I too am America." One college student recently looked through an anthology of Negro poems and gave a snort when he discovered that Paul Laurence Dunbar was a Negro, but he could hardly be blamed for his ignorance in the light of an experience which Guy Johnson had with a professor in one of the large colleges of the Southwest. It had been casually remarked that this professor was using some of Braithwaite's poetry in his course in English, and when Mr. Johnson complimented him upon his breadth, he indignantly refused to believe that Braithwaite could possibly have been a Negro.

The new figure in the recent literature of the South is the educated Negro, the Negro who has received the best training which our schools today can offer, both north and south of the Mason and Dixon line, and who comes back to his home town in a semi-missionary spirit, determined to serve his own people. T. S. Stribling gave us *Birthright* in 1922, and two years later Walter F. White, a southern Negro, gave us *The Fire in the Flint*. The problems which the heroes of these books met were about the same, the disappointments were everywhere of similar origin, and the temptation was

always there to go North for larger appreciation and friendship. The *Chicago Daily News* called *Birthright* the Uncle Tom's Cabin of our day, though it is entirely different. Critics point out that it was the author's ability "to rise above the conflict and see both the good and the bad in whites and blacks that raises this book above the level of a controversial tract." They add that it is "as surely a novel of American life as is *Main Street*." Stribling is talking about his own home town and the contrast between the white section and Niggertown is vividly pictured. Peter and Cissie have both been away to school, but they were as effectually bound to the old routine of life as though they had never tasted of culture. A weak element in the book is the assumption that the thing which made them want to get out of Niggertown with all its hideousness and its dangers from lack of sanitation, was not this culture in them, but the Caucasian blood in them. "Racially, we don't belong to Niggertown," Cissie said. The question of the inherent superiority of the mulatto over the full-blooded Negro is as yet an open question and it is dangerous to act upon generalities. But problems are there, and Stribling faithfully carried them through each detail. Can the average community which has always been used to treating the Negro as a "nigger" rather than a human being, readjust itself to the ever increasing number of intellectual blacks who are trying also to build the ideal community? Stribling seemed to think that it could not. The old Captain who befriended Peter, and whom we are led to suspect had some blood relationship with him, although he recognized in Peter a son of the same Alma Mater, Harvard, could not quite bring himself to the point of sitting down and talking with Peter or eating with him. Peter was not only an insubordinate secretary, but added to this was the artificial insubordination of his color. He was far ahead of the Captain in knowledge, for he was a graduate of the new Harvard, and the Captain had stopped his intellectual prowess when Darwin began to trickle into the South.

There was not only the discouragement of being held at arms' length by the few liberal white men in the community,

but there was the added difficulty of being suspected by the less fortunate people of his own race. His mother was resentful of his polished ways and he almost lost his life at the hands of the black war veteran, with medals of bravery on his breast, over the single romance which he had known, a romance which was in every respect normal and filled with those same reactions known to every human being. At his mother's funeral he couldn't howl like the others did, howling which went back to an African fear that the departed spirit would return in the form of a tiger or some calamity. Finally, he went north to Chicago, with Cissie, Cissie ruined by a white boy of the home where she cooked. His educational dream for his people had been thwarted by a banker interested in saving the heathen in Africa, and his proposal to unite the races on the basis of justice, justice to cooks, fell flat as a sort of labor organizer's attempt to start a cook's union. The sheriff advised him to leave the city and he gladly went.

The Fire in the Flint has even a more tragic end for the hero. Central City in South Georgia was a good deal like the little town in Tennessee where Peter tried to make good. Kenneth Harper was the most skilled physician in town, but his color alienated him from the whites and his youth made his own people distrust him. He had been eight years at school in Atlanta and took his medical degree in Philadelphia. He was the first colored interne at Bellevue in New York and continued his internship during the war when he patched up broken black bodies back of the trenches. The climax in his career is reached when he saves the life of a young white woman by performing a difficult operation which the white doctor wouldn't undertake. The emotions which prey upon the father at the time are cataclysmic. Kenneth goes to Atlanta to perform another operation, it being the nearest place where a hospital might be used by a Negro, and while there his brother is lynched for shooting two white men who had wronged his sister, Mamie. He returns home not knowing of the tragedy, and his terrible threats against the white race are interrupted by a 'phone call to come and save the life of the white girl he had previously operated on. The irony of

it swept over him like a dose of poison, but he went and saved her life once more. As he left the house he was killed by thirteen men who had been pledged to "get him" for his activities in forming Negro protective leagues among the farmers. Finding his car in front of this house, the husband gone to Atlanta, they misunderstood, and resolved to finish the matter then and there.

Many of the situations may be called far-fetched, but Mr. White has given us a book which will strike deeper than *Birthright*, because it is so penetrating and moving. Kenneth's father had always bowed and scraped to white people and Kenneth himself had been resolved to let the race question rigidly alone, but he was finally drawn into it just through the inevitable circumstances of life. A Negro doctor's well-being depended on the well-being of the Negroes about him, and they were mainly farmers, "share-croppers" who had been systematically robbed by shrewd white men. The National Negro Coöperative and Protective League simply sought to give the farmer his deserts and Kenneth became a crusader, even going to neighboring counties to explain it. "Only a few Negroes are lynched but thousands are robbed," someone told him. The basis of the Klan among the "poor whites" in the mill village is clearly shown, but it is lead by the store-keepers and sheriff and others who could use it for their own economic purposes. The other Negro doctor in town, who was jealous of Kenneth, helped in his undoing by conferring with a Klan leader. White has shown that the Negro in the South must be a chameleon. He may grovel before a white man, but he is thinking his own thoughts. Especially the educated Negro must have his variety of personalities, for in addition he is set apart from his own race.

But the struggle is not alone for economic justice and independence and *equality* before the law. It is for moral integrity. The educated Negro is demanding that the person of his wife be as inviolate as that of any white woman. The crime which a white man committed toward a black woman, aggravated by his murder of the woman's husband, was nothing. Kenneth was even cursed for reporting the death.

But the crime which he was simply *accused* of committing could only mean one thing, certain death. Kenneth felt a blind rage when he discovered this Negro woman one night beaten and tarred because she had "talked too much." The moral struggle of the individual Negro, made more difficult by the background of slavery, when he was supposed to have no morals, is hard enough with the *encouragement* of the white race, but when there is the iron-clad double standard phrased as "oh, that's different," then the struggle seems hopeless and useless.

So the modern educated Negro is a problem. He is a misfit, *not at home* with his own people back in his home community after the brief beautiful days of college are over, and ostracised from the culture he fed on in those days, usually in the hands of the white race. He is lonesome for mental stimulation, not from *books*, but from *people*. Kenneth took an appendix in a bottle to the office of the white doctor, anxious to sit down with him and talk about the case in a professional way, but he couldn't. He is surprised that he is suspected and that so many yet consider the educated Negro the rogue which Thomas Dixon pictured him. He is in no sense scheming for social equality, he simply wants intellectual sympathy. He hates to be treated like a child, he resents being put off in a Jim Crow compartment as something different. He wants his high unselfish ambitions to bear fruit in a moral way and is offended when they are misinterpreted and discouraged.

Like the handwriting on the wall a call came to Abraham in the play to lead his people. He knew they couldn't rise up until they had character and that they would get it only by *education*. He wanted to educate them away from their sins and stupidity. "I have been accused of wanting to make the Negro the equal of the white," he said. "That is false. I never preached such doctrine. . . . But I do say that we have equal rights to educating, and free thought and living moral lives."

A call came to Peter in *Birthright*. It lifted him above the strained relationships with the Captain and with the petty

wrangles with the old cook. It even made his romance with Cissie all but sink into the background. What was it? "He would go about showing white men and black the simple truth, the spiritual necessity for justice and fairness. It was not a question of social equality; it was a question of clearing a road for the development of Southern life. He would show white men that to weaken, to debase, to dehumanize the Negro inflicted a more terrible wound on the South than would any strength the black man might develop. He would show black men that to hate the white, constantly to suspect, constantly to pilfer from them, only riveted heavier shackles on their limbs." Finally, "the white South must humanize the black not for the sake of the Negro but for the sake of itself."

The newer and higher call comes from both races and is heard by both races; we must spiritualize ourselves together. Some day it will be impossible for anyone to say what was said to Kenneth: "It's a pity you're colored, you've got too much sense."

THE HUMAN SIDE OF FRANCIS LIEBER

LOUIS MARTIN SEARS

Duke University

AMERICANS of German origin would probably agree that with the exception of Carl Schurz the most eminent of their countrymen to migrate to the United States was Francis Lieber. Distinguished in his youth before he ever quit the Fatherland, his international reputation was the product in considerable degree of his contributions to his adopted country. Of undenied authority in Political Science and Economics, his last and chiefest service was the codification of military law for guidance in the conduct of the Civil War. But probably his most enduring gift to America lay in the inspiration he bequeathed to numerous generations of collegians, first at Columbia College in South Carolina, more latterly at Columbia University in the City of New York. A voluminous writer in many fields, his printed work reached formidable bulk. The impression it creates is one of truly German seriousness, of scholarship most orthodox. The note of levity scarcely once intrudes. The professor is Teutonically erudite.

There was a lighter vein, however, engagingly revealed in familiar correspondence between Lieber and Samuel B. Ruggles, of New York, a trustee of Columbia University, a friend who evidently appreciated the intimacy of the brilliant European.¹ Ruggles' letters in reply are not preserved. Adequate they must have been to keep alive a correspondence from 1842 to 1871. Always interesting and varied, the letters of this series are far more self-revealing than many papers of weightier pretense. In substance, they are here presented with a confidence that their author's eminence and their own content present a claim to thoughtful readers.

For some years, until, in fact, his object was achieved, Lieber constantly keeps before the mind of Ruggles the desirability of a transfer to New York. That runs as the pre-

¹This correspondence is preserved in the *Francis Lieber Papers*, Library of Congress.

vailing thread of purpose throughout the earlier correspondence. Lieber belonged to the idealistic movement of early XIXth Century Germany. Slavery in America could never be congenial. Pre-war South Carolina was an environment alien to his very spirit. The Civil War cast its shadows far ahead. Lieber longed to be on Northern soil before the catastrophe occurred. But these early letters, full of purpose though they are, and never losing sight of Lieber's goal, are rich and varied in their sidelights upon a singularly active mind.

In the opening letter of the series Lieber rather facetiously suggests that he would make even a suitable president for Columbia University. "But then I am a foreigner! True, yet I don't know how it is, history tells us that foreigners make the most loyal citizens. Two or three years ago I found upon entering in my recitation room, these words written on my blackboard: 'Why should a German draw South Carolina salary in Columbia?' I quietly took the chalk and wrote under it: 'Because South Carolina drew German blood at Camden.' You know, de Kalb fell here in the revolution. Indeed there never was a more Spanish Spaniard than Columbus the Genoese, nor a more English Englishman than William the Dutchman (nor indeed a greater benefactor to Britain); nor a more Prussian Prussian than Marshal Keith the Scot; nor a more German German than Eugene of Savoy; nor a more French Frenchman than Napoleon & B. Constant, nor a more genuine Swede than Bernadotte; nor a truer Briton than Romilly in whom not a drop of Anglican blood flowed, and had he happened to be born by parents in service of the French ambassador, he would have been as genuine a Frenchman by blood and law, as ever screamed 'La Grande Nation'! What Americans more American than Montgomery, Hamilton, Steuben, Gallatin, Lafayette—But I beg your pardon; I forget that I am running on, on a track which has little or nothing to do with the subject of this letter." Its purpose was to enlist Ruggles' interest in Lieber's candidacy for a Columbia position. As such the discounting of the foreign bogy was in reality perfectly germane. The ostensibly more

serious request was quizzically put. Lieber declared his willingness to instruct in the physiology of taste, with a kitchen for his laboratory and Ruggles and Kent for his students in that "eighth of the liberal arts—L'art de Cuisine."²

In current phrase the subject of his foreign origin had become a complex with Lieber. In a letter of September 14, 1842, the second of the series in review, he returned to the attack with a new and forceful presentation of his theme. "I wonder why I forgot to mention Cuvier, the great Cuvier. No one ever did more for France than this German by birth and education. Yet his whole activity was essentially French. I think I said in that letter, [previously cited] I did not know how it was but such was the fact that naturalized foreigners are always found among the most loyal citizens and greatest national benefactors. The truth is, I do not know how it is. If a man throws himself at the foot of the altar of a foreign country; if he does not merely settle in foreign parts for gain, but makes that country his, he wedds [*sic*] her, and as a man clings faster to his wife than even to father and mother, so he who does by choice what chance does for the native citizen. Having left his country, he is conscious that if he does not cleave to his wedded country, he floats in unsettled loneliness, and every generous heart requires *a country*, a soil to grow firm in. 'All France is my Family' was the key which Napoleon selected for his secret cyphers. Even Pitt, when urged by his friends to marry, replied: 'I have wedded England.' Turn to the opposite. Have there been many foreigners among the most prominent traitors recorded by history? I do not recollect any at this moment."

The lengthy letter of which the above is but an excerpt, included recommendations for the endowment of a series of tracts for enlightening popular opinion on subjects of civic interest, and closed with a characteristic refrain, "I shall see you soon, and may that God who guides the minds of Trustees, whatever God that may be—I don't know, I am sure—inspire those of Columbia College with something or other that will bring me Northward."³

² Columbia, S. C., July 14, 1842.

³ Boston, September 14, 1842.

The outcome so earnestly desired was still remote. In October, 1842, Lieber was well started on another year in South Carolina. The urgency for change was naturally diminished, since change was impracticable for at least another season. The correspondence assumes, accordingly, a character less supplicating. The loyalty of immigrants toward their adopted fatherland is elaborated further. "It is odd," says Lieber, "that in that brilliant list, as you call it, I should always have left out that character with whom, of all I am most in love. William of Nassau, prince of Orange, is my historical love. At least, I believe I have left him out, although I repeatedly intended to mention the omission to you. If, therefore, it be yet in time, you must do me the favour to lug in, where your taste tells you that it comes in best, the following passage.

'The founder of the Netherlands Independence; the hero of that first and bloodiest struggle of modern liberty and the people's sovereignty; the greatest of those citizens who have risen to the first chief magistracy through a revolution and a war of independence [*sic*] as Mackintosh calls William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, was a foreigner, a German, and not once did he betray or neglect the people, who entrusted their all to him, in his long and arduous life which ended with the martyrdom for liberty, long prepared and several times attempted by the assassins whom Philip the Second sent on their criminal mission.'

With this third reference Lieber turns aside from the high patriotism of the immigrant to relate a curious and touching anecdote of his own relations with the German poet, Jean Paul Richter. In his youth he submitted a poem to Richter's criticism. No reply forthcoming, he concluded that none was intended. "It helped strongly to draw my poetic tooth." The anecdote which follows is distinctly autobiographical. "Now, a Mrs. E. Lee of Boston asked me whether I was the Franz Lieber so kindly addressed in Jean Paul's letters preserved in his Biography. I answered I did not know, for I had never seen it. Upon the receipt of the copy of this letter I find that actually I am I, and that Franz

Lieber is this Franz Lieber. Jean Paul, who had delayed answering me on account of weak [*sic*] eyes, and because, as he says he was anxious to read the whole from the few poems which he had read or had been read to him, writes in the kindest and most encouraging manner, but the letter probably arrived after my flight from Berlin. Here, nearly twenty years afterwards, must I receive that answer as it were from the grave of the great poet, through a distant American woman—an entire stranger to me. When shall I hear from you? Will your answer also be found printed some twenty years hence? It would be a little too late.—By the way, this opinion of Jean Paul's might be mentioned should the Brother of the Sun ask again for testimonials. Kent knows what I mean. If a poor fellow has scribbled as much as I have, I think he might say, when testimonials are required, somewhat in the style of Wren's monument 'Circumspice'.⁴

More than one academic person has found February a month of discouragement. In 1843 Lieber was almost frenzied in his appeal for change. "But in earnest—get me to the North—I fairly am drying up here. My mind's energy flags. I cannot write or work, yet I feel that in me which might serve yet for a lustre or two." Passing to a theme less personal Lieber asks what Ruggles thinks of Webster's letter, a rhetorical question beyond doubt, for the writer immediately adds, "I have read it again and again. There is more of Demosthenes, yes Demosthenes in it, than in anything I know of in modern Literature—plain, cogent, tight, yet flowing with a glow, just sufficient to give colour to what otherwise might be too statue-like."⁵

Four years elapse before another letter in the present files. In March, 1847, Lieber begs his friend, just back from a sojourn in Europe, for a note of cheer to one so "niggered in" down South. Fun, he says, is the Southland's greatest need. "We want fun here quite as much as the Irish want bread."⁶

The War with Mexico was uppermost in American po-

⁴ Columbia, S. C., October 25, 1842.

⁵ Columbia, S. C., February 7, 1843.

⁶ Columbia, S. C., March 18, 1847.

litical thought and Lieber's letter of April 23rd sheds light upon the author's personality as well as upon the larger issues. "As to Mexico. The war is bad, thoroughly so, which I repeat a hundred times a day, to prevent me from applying for a commission, for, Ruggles, did I follow my feelings, I should sit on an officer's nag, and not in a professor's chair; I should help making history instead of teaching it. Good heavens! To teach political economy when those boys—but no more about it. It is an unrighteous war and I believe to *volunteer* in such, is taking the moral responsibility. Still as the war is made, I should certainly advise to make two conditions among others, for peace,—proper provision that we can cut the isthmus, and that we get California. I am against common conquest, as I have expressed it amply in my ethics . . . Attaching to our republic is very different from conquest between two despots. Mexico has done nothing with California. . . . I further think that having the Mexicans in our clutches—if Field-Marshal Vomito and Lt. General Fever don't get them out again—we ought to force them into a sensible tariff. But all *alliance* with them would be foolish and very seriously bad."

On the subject of the position in America of his German fellow-countrymen Lieber pronounced a dictum which every American—German or non-German in his origin—should ponder well. Lieber does not mince his words. "The Germans, freed peasants, are most of them here rabid democrats—novices and therefore fanatics in politics. But you forget that so soon as all this influx ceases to resemble the melting snow flowing into the sea, which remains sea after all, so soon will this influx become dangerous indeed. I love my country—I would lay my life down for it any day—(which is perhaps not very much, still it is all the life I happen to have) but when they talk of Germanizing America I spurn the idea. The German character furnishes stuff to make a nation of that might be good enough for the Lord's grenadiers; but what is it. Germany has no institutions, has no popular Common Law, no tradition of liberty. What, Germanizing America and draw out of our country the Anglican

institutions as the bones of a turkey, and leave a lump, fit only to be despatched? No, no—Modern liberty, people may say what they like, is after all essentially Anglican Liberty; develop, modify, change, trim, improve, but keep to the back bone. I wish I could send you the translation of a letter which I sent lately to a German Society, who called upon me to aid in keeping up German nationality here. A nationality in a nationality like a minnet in a pike! And what nationality? *Transplanted* nationality can consist in institutions only, and where are the German institutions? The princes have knocked every one on the head. Indeed, I would like to found an Anglico-German College, but that would be only for the two-fold object of promoting *assimilation*, and helping to bring over German knowledge and education."⁷

How far Lieber was from any ideas of socialism, such as his countrymen, Marx, Engels, and others were at this very time promulgating, is apparent in his comment of May 6, 1847, relative to further victories of the Americans in Mexico. The Isthmus, he says, must certainly be held by the United States for a minimum of thirty years. Meanwhile the canal must be cut and a monopoly enjoyed of all its tolls. "But the capital ought *not* if possible to come from the U. S. but private individuals."⁸

As the war with Mexico wore on, Lieber grew very pessimistic of its outcome. "We conquer, beat and occupy, and Peace, like a shadow recedes. The fact is I believe Mr. Polk *cannot* make a peace."⁹ On "Waterloo Day" of the same year, 1847, Lieber conceives of himself as the logical American delegate at a European convention of free traders. "I wish I could pilfer \$500 from John Jacob [Astor] and I would steam over during the vacations to the Free Trade Convention at Brussels. It will be a shame if America be not represented."¹⁰

Nothing more till March of 1849, when the near approach of grandfatherhood for Ruggles calls forth a pleasant

⁷ Columbia, S. C., April 23, 1847.

⁸ Columbia, S. C., May 6, 1847.

⁹ Columbia, S. C., October 23, 1847.

¹⁰ Waterloo Day, 1847.

whimsy. "I suppose there will be soon a new dignity conferred upon you—which a friend of mine hated so much that he often averred, he had no objection at all to his daughter's revelling in the joys of maternity, but that she had no right to make him a grandfather and he would not submit to it. Grandpapa! What a fearful name! Why it sounds more awful than Holy Father or Patriarch of Constantinople. Fuddy ought to be more considerate and mindful of the feelings of her 'Governor'."¹¹

New life within the Ruggles home soon gave way to death, calling from the sympathetic soul of Lieber a very touching expression of his grief and of his hope. "Had I a healing balm for torn hearts of fathers or mothers, you should certainly have it. But when houses are draped in mourning, we hear and acknowledge all the comfort which can be given and bow to God's decrees, and yet the heart continues to bleed and the eye to weep. And it ought to be so; for there cannot be life without death, and, therefore, no love without grief. Nor can we help seeing that grief is a substantive element of the whole mental and moral and affectional economy which our Maker has seen fit to establish for us. But since it is God who has done so, there must be wisdom and goodness in this checkered allotment, and there would be no goodness, but immeasurable and unspeakable cruelty, were all to end here, and were love of this world ought else than seed of flowers to bloom in Heaven. Whether he who sinks into the grave is sinking into a long lethargy, long lasting silence enwrapping him, until a day of great revival, or whether life continues forever in a state [of] full and unbroken consciousness—who can say that he knows it. My feelings, my instincts lead me to believe the departed only depart, and that they perceive us. But who can know? I do know that death, is not death, but death is life."¹²

That so religious a spirit as Lieber's, of which the preceding letter is witness, should have been the subject of an inquisition for heresy in the South Carolina legislature, is

¹¹ Columbia, S. C., March, 1849.

¹² Columbia, S. C., June 24, 1850.

sufficient condemnation of contemporary fundamentalists. But the friends of freedom had the grace to table the investigation, and Lieber was not seriously molested.¹³

So far did Lieber overcome the flesh, that on January 24, 1853, he was able to announce to Ruggles his victory over smoking. "The heroic age is returning! I think my friends ought to cause a medal to be struck in commemoration of this the most remarkable event of the nineteenth century: on the obverse my portrait, on the reverse St. George on horseback trampling on a broken regalia; James the Second [first], the anti-smoking King, handing him the order of the garter."¹⁴

A New Year's letter from the distinguished professor to the dignified trustee of Columbia University is quaint testimony to the essential oneness of the classes. Learning does not dehumanize, if we accept this evidence.

New Year's Day, 1854.

A happy new year to you and may you prosperously go on on your good ways and mend your bad ones! Sapienti 'sat! You know what I mean. If I were you I would go East and hire myself out as a Mute. You would fetch a high price.

My dear Ruggles, I beg you to get the enclosed inserted in some widely read newspaper of your city with such introductory remarks as the editor may deem fit. 'Every drop helps a little,' as an old German miller used to say, with whom I was quartered for some days when a stripling soldier, and who would never permit me to make water below the mill. 'Go and p— on the wheel,' he would say, 'every drop helps a little.' With this graceful anecdote for a New Year's present I conclude my epistle.

Ever yours,

F. Lieber.

A long postscript followed.

In June, 1854, Lieber writes very happily of a tribute paid by Rufus Choate to the "Ethics" and the "Liberty" which had proceeded from his pen.¹⁵

Working quietly and steadily, Lieber had become a great figure, even though an unwilling one, on the South Carolina College campus. In 1854 its presidency was vacant. Many felt that Lieber was the logical incumbent. His foreign origin

¹³ Columbia, S. C., January 12, 1853.

¹⁴ Columbia, S. C., January 24, 1853.

¹⁵ S. C. C., June 10, 1854.

and his anti-slavery views proved, however, an insuperable obstacle. Also his non-sectarianism was a hindrance. "What a man I would be had I become a Methodist! I think I shall go to Utah. The other day I made out a list, with my wife, of the additional patriarchesses, in case I should become a Mormon, and a pretty nice list we did make out."¹⁶

A melancholy commentary follows on the too frequent absence of amenities among scholars. Perhaps Lieber's alien birth made him the more sensitive to slights from eminent Americans. Certainly he felt keenly the failure of the historian Bancroft to take note of him. "Mr. Bancroft is expected here. I shall call on him, but I hardly else know what to do. He has never shown me even the commonest civilities, never asked me to see him, and now when they invited to the semi-centennial celebration of the Historical Society all sorts of people, even Simms the novelist of Charleston, he had not even the decency to put my name on the list. These things are not said to complain. Far from it. He may do as he chooses, but when men of similar pursuits and similar standing (both of us are members of the Institute) omit toward one another those common civilities which are extended to almost any acquaintance, I think in such case the omissions assume a somewhat positive character. At any rate when I shall call on him I shall do more than he has ever done to me when I am a stranger.

"I return to that historical society. Winthrop sent me the procedure, and as I said, I found that e.g. my friend Hillard was invited, Allison, Grote, yet I am left out, although professor of history and known as publicist. Such things prove very strongly how a man is lost here."¹⁷ [i.e., in the South.]

After years of anxious hope that a professorship in Columbia University would fall to him, and after years of mounting impatience with his lot in South Carolina, Lieber finally took the step of severing his Southern ties without as yet replacing them by Northern. His announcement of the

¹⁶ S. C. C., Christmas Eve, 1854.

¹⁷ Columbia, S. C., April 1, 1855.

event to Ruggles contains some pithy sentences. "I have resigned my professorship in South Carolina College. You know me sufficiently to be convinced that no peevishness can have been the motive. It is the man the majority of the Trustees have appointed and the means used to foil my election as president, with the knowledge that the College will go to pieces, that have made me resign."¹⁸ A bit later he adds: "You are astonished that I could stand a 20 long years' residence here. The answer is simple. They paid me a salary. With all my friends and all the people at Cambridge saying they want me, I have never had an offer."¹⁹

Undated, but in this month of his resignation, Lieber paid his respects to college politics and to the triumph of the wicked. "They would be glad enough to keep me here—as professor. All the papers are up for me, so far at least as my disconnexion with the College goes, and the election of Mr. M'Cay, a mean fellow, as president is universally condemned.

"With some few exceptions I say that my resignation is universally approved of so far as I am personally concerned.

"We have now vacation. When the students will return we shall have a dire time. An overwhelming majority of the students is for me. It is the election of this man, utterly incompetent and mean, that makes my rejection so shameful. Alas! it is but another illustration of the fact that the glib and tricky almost always carry the day over the candid and sincere. I knew this and I know it, but I do not chose [*sic*] to accept success on condition of losing my self respect. This is a curious world."²⁰

An underlying motive for his resignation is revealed in the comment on its probable acceptance or rejection. "Most Confidential, Most private and inviolately secret. In one, all-meaning word: *Mum!* . . . My resignation is to be acted upon in May. They will suggest to me to withdraw it. I certainly shall not do it without some conditions, and even then reluctantly. Besides, matters I tell you stand very badly. I

¹⁸ Columbia, S. C., December 13, 1855.

¹⁹ Columbia, S. C., December 30, 1855.

²⁰ Columbia, S. C., December, 1855.

am no alarmist. It lies in the cursed thing, the slavery itself. Now if we separate (although nothing whatever can be gained by it—but that is frequently not the question in history) I want to be with you and not here. This of course is to be destroyed after reading, and must remain burried [*sic*] in your breast."²¹

The circumstances leading to his resignation focused the attention of Lieber upon a number of administrative questions not yet solved to the satisfaction of all college faculties. "I have always spoken against the silly uniformity of salaries of professors here. The objection that it would create envy among the professors, or that they would not be looked upon by the students with equal respect, is no objection at all. They are never looked upon with equal respect—depend upon that; and variety in the market value is in every sphere. Besides, it might be just as well said that the uniformity of salaries deprives the higher talents and older names of a proportion due to them, and has a low leveling effect."²²

It must have been very difficult for Lieber to conceal from South Carolinian espionage his views on slavery. Murder will out. Lieber's homely observations on the discovery are worth recording. "I think I may as well let you know my dear Cross Bones, that an attack has been made upon your unworthy friend for—what do you think? Keeping a mulatto girl? That would be a trifle! For having killed a person? Pshaw! we don't talk of bagatelles here! For high treason? Why, that might recommend me. No, for ABOLITIONISM on the ground of an article published in 1828 in the *Americana*. Yes, mark that down! I have been asked to reply. I would as lief reply to a question in the papers what I think of a plurality of wives, or how I tuck away my shirt between the legs."²³

Another autumn came with Lieber still in South Carolina but eager to be gone. On October 23rd he wrote Ruggles of a compliment received from Dr. Woolsey, President of Yale College, in which he was described as "the first political writer

²¹ Columbia, S. C., January 20, 1856.

²² Columbia, S. C., April 4, 1856.

²³ Columbia, S. C., May 9, 1856.

in America." Lieber wishes Ruggles to pass this on to Mr. Cooper who is understood to be seeking only first rate men for his Cooper Union. It may not be amiss to note that for three years Woolsey has been using Lieber's book on Civil Liberty as a text at Yale.²⁴

The world so unqualifiedly accepts the eminence of Lieber that it would be surprising if he had not been aware of his own gifts. The candor with which he states his own claims, however, is sometimes artless and naïve. For example, in the letter from which the previous citation on the Woolsey compliment was quoted, Lieber goes on to compare himself with contemporary and past celebrities. "Are you reading De Tocqueville's *Old Regime*? In spite of a few apparent contradictions, it is an excellent book and a very Commentary upon 2 or 3 chapters of my *Civil Liberty*. There is a peculiar class of pol. philosophers or publicists, which might be called historico-philosophical publicists, the three most prominent of which, so far as I know, are Montesquieu, De Tocqueville and Lieber. I really write this with perfect calmness. 'So much the worse', you say, perhaps. I don't know. I remember when the famous Mrs. Hertz stood with me before her own portrait, painted when she was young, and said after a long contemplation: Ah, I was really beautiful—without the least vanity, but as a mere fact.

"But Montesquieu or not, I like you; I want to be near you; I want to be able to talk with you; I want to be pared, clipped and adjusted by you, and I want to pinch, poke and punch you.

"Your idea about S. C. and Mass. is excellent, only get it passed in the shape of a resolution. If Sumner has repeated the old saying that the country is of God &c he has repeated something very stupid, which the Rev. Vaughn in his *Age of Large Cities* has long exposed. What *country* is of God? That with stiles and ditches, fields and orchards? And why is the populous street less of God? Surely the men who built them of necessity, that is according to laws in their nature, are as much of God as trees and pumpkins. All

²⁴ Columbia, S. C., October 23, 1856.

civilization essentially starts with cities and the cities always remain the lungs and brains of civilization. The country's great business is to keep them from rising to fever heat.—Do you know that writing on yellow paper to a man so near the yellow fever as I am, is an insult?"²⁵

A letter on the subject of the cable is of interest from several points of view. "In a few days the Cable will reach, Deo volente, New Foundland. Let all the Earth say: Amen, and thank the Lord for this one great thing, in a period when smallness, vulgarity, petty personality, and ignoble craving for wealth with the lowest endeavour to spend it in upholstery sway the world, and in which great men are as rare as good claret is dear. Were I a clergyman [*sic*] I should certainly have spun a long pulpit yarn from this blessed cable. But most of our ministers would preach about Balem [*sic*] even were they called upon to hold forth from the drum pulpit on the eve of the battle of Leipzig."²⁶

The cable called forth a second paean. "Three cheers by all creation! I must write to you, who by leading water to where there was none, is engaged in the same cause in which those are engaged that have just succeeded in laying the cable."²⁷—it is all the great cause of intercommunion and intercommunication. I know you will feel stirred. God be thanked that he [*sic*] has granted us this great thing in a year otherwise full of lapses and relapses.

"I have looked again at my ode [on the Cable], changed and added, and send you a copy. You can give it to a Rochester editor. Did not Grotius too compose verses? Mine are poor enough as verses, but not some thoughts in them."²⁸ Some will see in Lieber's comparing of himself with Grotius a promotion over the previous Montesquieu—De Tocqueville stage.

The Fourteenth of July brought forth a note not commemorative of Bastille or history, but so redolent of the soil, if one may so express it, that Lieber's unquestioned intel-

²⁵ Columbia, S. C., October 23, 1856.

²⁶ New York, August 20, 1857.

²⁷ Ruggles was a Canal Commissioner.

²⁸ August 6, 1858.

lectual vigor may be construed as straight from Mother Earth, a natural product unspoiled by hyper-sophistication: "Pardon me, Sir Trustee, that I venture to write this note in my shirt sleeves, and was on the point of writing it in my shirt tail. Oh, for the happy state of Adam before his fall! Can nothing dis-fig-leafize us again? I feel in my veins a fanatical desire for a pre-lapsarian state, *pure et simple*."²⁹

If Lieber did not hesitate at times to take a fling at their reverences, the clergy, he none the less was conscious of their social influence. And a letter of "Friday morning," otherwise undated but apparently from 1859, urges Ruggles, who was bound for Richmond as a delegate to a Protestant Episcopal convention, to take a stand on slavery. Safe from his new coigne of vantage in New York, Lieber castigates the object of his detestation.

"If, dear Ruggles, the 'gentleman going to Richmond &c.' is yourself, then I wish you to know that ch. VIII of vol. III of *Histoire de L'Esclavage*, par H. Wallon, Paris 1847, contains '*L'Eglise et L'Esclavage*'—the *very thing you want*.

"I trust that, especially after what the bp. of Tennessee had the unchristian impertinence to say, nothing will be said at Richmond which in the least degree can be interpreted as a reluctance on the part of the Northern Episcopalians to say and have it broadly known that they consider slavery the greatest evil of modern history which our race has to eject again out of its system; or as in any the slightest degree countenancing the godless scheme calling slavery a divine institution.

"I make no doubt that in the church as elsewhere, the only, the only true, dignified and christian course is to show that unity and peace being desirable, they are not the optima, nor the *summa bona*.

"Do you know that I have been requested by a gentleman in the South, to collect a variety of things, to *strengthen* him for his speech which he will be obliged to make in his Legislature to support his Report adverse to the re-opening of the

²⁹ New York, 14/7. 59. 89° Fahrenheit in my library.

Slave Trade. We must sometimes remember that we live in the middle of the 19th century."³⁰

It was natural that a man like Lieber, whose early training had been in Germany where popular professors stood to profit greatly under the student fee system, and whose experience in American colleges had demonstrated his own power to attract the students whose fees under a different system would have enriched him personally, should chafe under the American plan of professorial emolument so considerably devised to comfort mediocrity. A letter of August 31, 1859, to Ruggles extols the European system, but will not be quoted here.

Never oblivious of his important claims to recognition, Lieber wished to be remembered for a vacancy in the Board of Trustees of the Astor Library. With almost maiden coyness he writes as follows: "Whom [will] you elect Trustee of Astor Library instead of Irving. Will any one think of me? Not that I want it, or that it be a peculiar distinction, nor that my election would be the best—I don't know that at all, but that I think it would be natural that some one or other would think of my name where books and library and that sort of things are thought of, in the city of N. York."³¹

One looks elsewhere among the voluminous Lieber writings for his most significant reflections on the politics of 1860 and the ensuing Civil War. The present informal collection gives, however, occasional gleanings. For example: "Politics go their well accustomed way, that is to say, as bad as can be. Senator Mason has told the world that they know better than their forefathers, and that it enobles [*sic*] both races to have one of them for sale. They ought to adopt a flag on which, instead 'With the Lord,' or 'God is with us' or 'Our Right and our Country', and all such obsolete devices, an auction table ought to be painted, with a negro on it and a white man feeling his teeth. A man reputed to be a gentleman like Mr. Mason, says in the middle of the 19th Century what no psychologist can explain except either by willful denial of truth or an embruted intellect, yet neither can readily

³⁰ Friday morning [otherwise not dated].

³¹ Owlry, December 3, 1859.

be ascribed to such a man as Mason. Oh, for the Virginia gentleman!"⁸²

One gleans from occasional passages in this friendly and sometimes even humorous correspondence that Lieber was too jealous of his rights to make invariable good company. The note of acerbity creeps in at times, as in the Bancroft reference. The same is true in the letter just now cited, for Lieber goes on to say: "As to city doings—all full of parties. Hon. Hamilton Fish, the Chairman of Trustees of Columbia College gave a party to which every one was invited, except the professors of said College—at least we were not."⁸³

The present correspondence is fragmentary throughout the period of Civil War. Letters were not written or else they were not kept. The following comments on man's love of justice have a possible pertinence, from the time that they were penned. "God has so made man that if the rogue does not always *love* justice, he, at any rate, always *resents* injustice, and universally feels that wherever injustice is done the foundation, aim and purpose of social life, of State and Government are violated and abused. The idea of justice which unfolds itself as soon as two people live together, nay even where one individual meditates upon himself from two different aspects, is the very clay of which the potter forms the vessel called *state*, and which receives the idea of love like an essential oil. We can imagine justice without love, but not love without pre-existing justice. All the message of evangelical love can be addressed only to beings willing first of all to be just. I am writing this on Sunday; I hope it has no undomonical character."⁸⁴

Not many days after the firing on Fort Sumter, Lieber offered a rather pungent analysis of the diplomatic situation. "I understand that all the foreign ministers in Washington, with the exception of the Russian, incline to the South. There are Five Points in New York; there are Five Great Powers in Europe, and there are Five Great Forces of Civilization—the Force or Power of Wealth and Industry; the

⁸² New York, January 29, 1860.

⁸³ New York, January 29, 1860.

⁸⁴ New York, September 9, 1860.

Power of Thought; the physical Power; the Moral Power and Le Pouvoir Dinatoire—the last as efficacious as either of the others; and I must be much mistaken if the Southern Members of Congress have not used the Dinatory Power much better than the Northern Congressmen. So much for supping, sipping, and sauce. When shall we have a fight.”³⁵

In the present papers there is a letter from Lieber to “My dear Sir,” evidently not Ruggles but presumably an editor of Lieber’s Works, containing the view, which he declares was oft expressed, that Chief Justice Taney’s Opinion in the Dred Scott Case was “what in the Catholic Church would be called a *scandalum magnum*.”³⁶

A communication to Ruggles alludes to the Military Code drawn up by Lieber for the Union Army, in terms of almost unexpected modesty. “Although I feel quite sure that I have sent you weeks ago a copy of my draft of a Code I send you another to-day renewing my request to give me the benefit of any suggestions you may think proper to make. The whole will soon be issued as an army order—much enlarged and I hope improved.”³⁷

Columbia College, goal of years of aspiration, does not appear to have been the anticipated bed of roses. Certainly in 1865 when Lieber’s reputation as publicist was at its very height, his professorial tenure was insecure. There is pathos in the following comment: “History and Political Economy are taught in all Colleges. Rev. Dr. McVickar justly prides himself on having introduced the latter into Columbia College—long, long, ago. Lieber’s Civil Liberty and Self Government is used in many American colleges as text book. It is so in Yale College and President Woolsey has dedicated to Lieber his Law of Nations. Here, however, it is proposed to abolish the Chair of H. and Political Economy and to eliminate the author of that text book. There seems to be something inconsistent in this.”³⁸

A letter of three days later throws light upon the subject.

³⁵ Owlry, May 24, 1861.

³⁶ New York, November 21, 1862.

³⁷ New York, April 6, 1863.

³⁸ New York, June 12, 1865.

The wish of President King that Lieber avoid interviewing Bishop Potter coincides with the estimate of Lieber's tact which the reader of these letters can scarce escape from forming. The allusion to discipline requires no exegesis:

Your Office
15 June 1865
1865 [*sic*]

My dear Ruggles,

King [President of Columbia College] told me he would go to Bp. Potter, which would be better than my seeing him.

I have sent the examination papers of the Junior Class to Mr. Strong, who wanted them. I think they were very fair.

I am now nearly convinced that the 'want of discipline' is an after thought. The idea of eliminating me is an effect of the inroad of the mining school. It is right for the trustees to promote the mining school, but let it not be at the cost of the college proper. Do not reduce the college. The College must be after all the trunk of the whole, etc., etc.

In the present files is another letter to "My dear Sir," not to Ruggles, the postscript to which quotes a compliment to Lieber which in view of his own appetite for praise and the embarrassments of his Columbia position must have been doubly gratifying. "Bluntschli has delivered a lecture on my Letter to Mr. Seward. I think you ought to get a copy of his *Das moderne Kriegerrecht* or *Gesetzbuch dargestellt*, Nordlingen 1866. I have written for some copies. He sent me one in advance."³⁹

The ties with Columbia were not really severed until after 1871. Lieber's note to Ruggles on this subject was underscored as "Confidential." In it he said: "I suppose that the U. S. and Mexican Joint Committee, of which I am Umpire, will be continued by Congress to January 1, 1873. Now whether the Committee will leave open my resignation to 1872-73, I leave to them." Here he adds a word of genuine affection—a very charming touch. "How long is it that we have been friends? When was it that we dined at Mr. Gouder's down at the battery? For there I think I saw you the first time. I suppose a friendship having lasted so long, will hold out the few years longer that remain, to be renewed without interruption."⁴⁰

³⁹ New York, May 27, 1866.

⁴⁰ New York, October 6, 1871.

A sequel to the above, penned two days later, constitutes almost the valedictory of the Lieber-Ruggles correspondence as the files are now preserved. It is Lieber's testament, not merely to his friend but to mankind. His theme is internationalism. "I have seen of late repeatedly your name in European catalogues, in connexion with your *Coin Report*. Pray, let not present and pressing things press the Universal Coin Question into the back ground or, still worse, from the fanum of your brain. Internationalism is part of a white man's religion, for it is the application of the Gosple [sic] to the intercourse of nations, and Universal Coinage would be one of the greatest elements of all Internationalism."

From this high plane, the apex of the correspondence, the writer suddenly descends to that complaisant egotism which constitutes in part his charm, for frankness is disarming. "Internationalism reminds me of my pamphlet. Have I told you that an Italian jurist calls it an *aureo opusculo*. I do not know him, but he sent me his work, and a very instructive one it is. Wheaton, Lawrence, Lieber are quoted continually in it."⁴¹

The concluding note of the Ruggles files is one of business—a request that his friend withhold Lieber's resignation for another year.⁴² Dear indeed to Lieber were his academic affiliations.

If the letters cited here afford a clew to Lieber's many-sided intellect and character, it consists apparently in the revelation of his warmth of nature—his affection for Ruggles is self-evident—; in the frequent recognition of an over-ruling Providence, a Divinity that doth shape our ends; and in a charming ingenuousness regarding Lieber's personal attainments. The letters of a great man can not be other than worth while. Character and achievements, points of view, collected wisdom, will invariably crop out. Lieber is to this by no means an exception. His writings furnish their own vindication and deserve intelligent perusal.

⁴¹ New York, October 8, 1871.

⁴² New York, December 3, 1871.

THE FRENCH COLONIAL ARRÊT OF 1784

FREDERICK L. NUSSBAUM

University of Wyoming

THE SUCCESSFUL outcome of the American War of Independence presented the great colonial powers the problem of readjusting their relations to one of the greatest colonial markets of that day. The thirteen states, politically independent, now stood outside of the colonial system of the British Empire, outside of the prohibitions and regulations which, however imperfectly enforced, had conditioned their exploitation. It was possible to contemplate their partial economic annexation to the French or to the Spanish system, or, for that matter, reannexation to the British system. The policies followed in these circumstances by the British and by the Spanish have been carefully studied and set forth.¹ The aspect which the American opportunity presented to an enterprising mercantile community of central Europe was discussed some years ago in an interesting article by Professor William E. Lingelbach.²

The policy of the French Monarchy, on the other hand, has been almost wholly ignored. Aside from a few banal summaries of the history of the debt, the most earnest search reveals no systematic account of the relations between the two nations, at the time so closely allied and presently, in spite of sympathetic political principles, to find themselves at loggerheads. Yet these post-war relations have an importance both for the history of the United States and for that of France which justifies serious study. The background of Genet's failure, of the Jay treaty, and of the Quasi-war is to be found in the failure of French policy to develop the natural sympathies of the Americans by intensifying the bonds of commerce. On the other hand, the collapse of the Ancient Régime is closely bound up with the failure of the Monarchy

¹ Channing, *History of the United States*, vol. III; Bemis, *The Jay Treaty*; Chadwick, *The Relations of the United States and Spain: Diplomacy*.

² "Saxon-American Relations, 1778-1828." *American Historical Review*, XVII, 517.

to satisfy its ancient supporters, the merchants and traders, either by retaining old markets or capturing new ones.

Matthew Carey, the great American protectionist, long ago set the fashion (little followed) of finding the interpretation of the French Revolution in the breach between the monarchy and the middle classes when he declared that the Treaty of 1786 caused it.³ I have attempted elsewhere⁴ to show that the impolitic handling of the tobacco question operated in the same direction by alienating American trade and French traders. I now propose to recount the failure of the Monarchy to readjust the colonial régime to the needs of the time and the demand for representative government which developed in this connection.

With the coming of peace, the French government, without reluctance or hesitation, adopted a policy of generous treatment to American vessels entering France. Free-ports were granted, American whale-oil was put on a most-favored nation basis, port dues were studied with the intention of reducing their multiplicity and burdensomeness from the American point of view, and the Farmers-General were urged to moderate their rigors against American cargoes. From the French standpoint, however, if not from the American, the problem of the islands was quite separate from that of the general encouragement of trade and the French government approached that question with considerable deliberation.

The old régime of exclusion had endured for a century and more without substantial change. True, the exigencies of war in 1755 and 1778 had led to the temporary opening of the American islands to the trade of the world and, in particular, to the Americans. In 1767, the desperate need of the growing colonies had forced the creation of two free ports in the islands, the Port-du-Cârenage in Santa Lucia and the Môle-St.-Nicholas in Santo Domingo, to which foreign vessels might carry cargoes limited to timber, dyewoods, live stock, raw or tanned hides, furs, grapes and tar, and from

³ Quoted in Dropper, *Outline of Economic History in the XIX Century*, p. 66.

⁴ "American Tobacco and French Politics, 1783-1789", *Political Science Quarterly*, Dec., 1925.

which they might export only molasses and rum. This limited list, of course, included only such articles as distance from supply or other natural limitations made unsuitable for French trade. The ancient principles and vested interests of exclusion were strong enough to restrict the freedom granted in such wise that it included nothing from which a French profit might be drawn at the expense of the colonist. In particular, it did not include the importation of flour or of any other food stuff nor the exportation of sugar and coffee.⁵

The *arrêt* of 1767 thus fell far short of the needs of the colonists, the more painfully so because of the failure of French merchants to furnish an adequate supply of salt meat and fish, rice and wheat—all necessary for the proper maintenance of the Negro slaves upon whom the prosperity of the colonies, especially of Santo Domingo, depended. The Administrators were obliged repeatedly to admit these articles, occasionally to admit the Americans to all the ports on account of the unsuitability of the Môle and in 1769, even to admit flour. With the intervention of France in the American War, the Administrators threw open all the admiralty ports to all foreigners without distinction. This period of free trade acquainted the colonists with the benefits of an unlimited supply of cheap food for the Negroes.⁶

With the end of the war, whether the advantages which the colonists had derived from unrestricted relations with the Americans were to be continued or the ancient privileges restored for the benefit of French merchants, became an open question. Naturally, the traditional policy was uppermost in the minds of the Government. The Administrators' ordinance of 1778, admitting foreign vessels into French colonial ports, was annulled in 1783 by ministerial letter.⁷ The policy to be followed, however, was not clearly conceived by the French ministers before the end of the war. Vergennes saw that

⁵ *Arrêt* of July 29, 1767. See also memoir of Barbé-Marbois, dated June 2, 1783. Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Docs., É. U. 14:55.

⁶ "Mémoire de la Chambre d'Agriculture du Cap sur les nouvelles prohibitions contre la liberté d'introduction des Américains du Continent dans les Ports de la Colonie de Saint-Domingue." Reprinted in *Recueil des différentes pièces pour et contre l'admission des Etrangers dans les Isles Françaises de l'Amérique*, pp. i-xxxviii. Cited as *Recueil*.

⁷ "Mémoire de la Chambre d'Agriculture du Cap." *Recueil*, loc. cit.

something should be done to counteract the attractions of the liberal policy which, it seemed in the spring of 1783, the English Parliament was likely to adopt,⁸ but as late as May 11, neither he nor De Castries had any notion as to whether French vessels which had touched at ports of the United States should be admitted to the islands.⁹

The propaganda for the retention of the prohibitive régime was comparatively slight, so far as evidence remains, and seems to have come largely from the agricultural interests and merchants in the south-west, from Bordeaux and Guienne, whence most of the grain and flour for the colonies was shipped and whence the Americans were expected to supply themselves with sugar and indigo. The rumor that Franklin and the American commissioners were going to ask for free admission to all the colonies was current in Bordeaux as early as July 29, 1783, and increased the "alarms" of business as it grew more definite.¹⁰ Lafayette recognized the settled opposition to a liberal policy in the islands among the farming interests around Bordeaux.¹¹ As the year 1784 grew more productive of rumors about the admission of the Americans, the protests of Bordeaux grew more formal and more emphatic.¹²

On the other hand, the colonists and the Americans conducted something like an organized propaganda in favor of the admission of the Americans. The Chamber of Agriculture of the Cape, Santo Domingo, declared that French commerce had always failed in its function of providing adequately for the needs of the colonies, specifically in 1767 and 1769, and that almost every year it had been necessary to suspend the prohibitions. At the moment of writing, the rigid enforcement of the prohibitions against the Americans had brought it about that not a quintal of salt meat was to

⁸ Vergennes to Joly de Fleury, March 13, 1783. Arch. Aff. Étr., Corresp. pol., É. U., 23:291.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 24:199.

¹⁰ Texier to Vergennes, Bordeaux, July 29, 1783. Arch. Aff. Étr., Corresp. pol., É. U., 25:107.

¹¹ *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States, 1783-1789*. I, 280. Lafayette to R. Morris, Dec. 26, 1783.

¹² "Mémoire des négociants de Bordeaux," April 3, 1784; D. de Mouchy to Vergennes, April 9, 1784. Arch. Aff. Étr., Corresp. pol., É. U. 27:238, 274.

be had. Even the French slave traders carried their blacks to Havana rather than to the markets in the French islands. French commerce as a whole would benefit, it was urged, more from the advantages of the general prosperity that would result from admitting the Americans than from its especially privileged condition.¹³ *Le Pour et Contre*, an anonymous pamphlet,¹⁴ from its acquaintance with colonial matters apparently written or inspired by a colonist, launched a radical attack on the whole mercantilist position, which in a more rational world would have demolished it entirely. The writer denied that the interests of the merchants were the interest of the nation.

It would seem, however, that the ultimately significant pressure for the liberalization of the colonial régime came from sources that may be called American: Lafayette, Barbé-Marbois, Gouverneur Morris. The American government itself did little. When Lafayette returned to France in the end of 1783, Jay wrote to Franklin, "This is a most favorable season for France to relax the severe commercial restrictions which oppose our trade to her islands;"¹⁵ but it was rather through Lafayette that American wishes were expressed and American influence exerted. He enjoyed the confidence of the American government, he had the ear of the French government, and he had a program that envisaged the greater prosperity, economic and political, of both. It is not strange, then, that he took naturally the otherwise anomalous position of representative of the American government and adviser of the French, without instructions and without responsibility. Vergennes received his memoirs,¹⁶ De Castries discussed colonial policy with him officially,¹⁷ and Calonne authorized

¹³ "Mémoire de la Chambre d'Agriculture du Cap sur les nouvelles prohibitions contre la liberté de l'introduction des Américains du Continent dans les ports de la Colonie de Saint Domingue". (Not signed or dated) Cited above.

¹⁴ "Le Pour et Contre sur un objet de Grande Discorde et d'Importance Majeu: convient-il à l'administration de céder part ou de ne rien céder aux Étrangers dans le commerce de la Métropole avec ses colonies?" pp. lv-cxii in *Recueil* cited above.

¹⁵ Jay to Franklin, Dec. 13, 1783. Franklin's *Works* (Bigelow edition), IX, 71.

¹⁶ Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Docs., É. U., 2:100.

¹⁷ De Castries to Lafayette, June 27, 1784. *Diplomatic Correspondence of the U. S.*, I, 299.

him to present the complaints of the Americans about the system of port dues.¹⁸ Lafayette's program, embodied in a memoir¹⁹ submitted early in 1784, shortly after his return from the United States, was very simple. He proposed that without a treaty and without any restricting bargains, the French government should establish of its own motion such favors to American commerce that it could not fail to be attracted to France. Besides the abolition of the complex port dues, the establishment of two free ports in addition to the two promised by the Treaty of 1778, and the provision of long credit arrangements, comparable to those of the English, he urged the opening of the colonies to the Americans as the only measure that would enable them to meet the balance of trade, which would necessarily remain against them. Salt meats and fish and flour could be furnished by the Americans so much more cheaply than by the French merchants and sugar was so much in demand among them that it was useless to hope that prohibitions could be effective. Any relaxation could at least be experimentally made and in case it proved itself unsatisfactory could be undone.

Barbé-Marbois had what seems to be a more definite program.²⁰ He proposed the maintenance of the prohibitive system, with a number of exceptions based upon a realistic conception of the relations between the metropole, the colonies, and the United States. More effective control was to shut the Americans out of the indirect trade with Europe while free importation into the colonies in French vessels, and restricted importation in American vessels of the whole list of goods enumerated in the *arrêt* of 1767 plus flour, the reëxportation to Europe of American tobacco from the colonies and the direct exportation of molasses and sugar to the United States should be permitted. In a word, Barbé-Marbois was proposing the organization of a French "triangular" trade, with the United States shut out of the Europe-West Indies leg, and at a slight disadvantage, as compared with the

¹⁸ Lafayette to R. Morris, Jan. 10, 1784. *Ibid.* I; 290.

¹⁹ "Observations de M. le Marquis de la Fayette sur le commerce entre la France et les États-Unis." Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Docs., É. U., 2:100 et seq.

²⁰ "Mémoire sur le commerce entre la France et les États-Unis." Philadelphia, June 2, 1783. Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Docs., É. U., 14:55 et seq.

French, in the West Indies-United States leg of the triangle. His proposal was mercantilist in spirit, to be sure, but it had the merit of relating itself to the needs of the colonists and of the United States rather than to the cautious greed of the French merchant.

Gouverneur Morris seems to have had some voice with the French government in this issue, although the only document indicating direct relations is a letter of his written by request to the Marquis de Chastellux and dispatched on July 1, 1784.²¹ With that drastic common sense which characterized his thinking on most political subjects, he urged that all the ports of the islands be made free ports, and the special interests of French merchants protected only by reasonably high preferential duties.

Whatever the weight of the several influences, the French government began to move towards the liberalization of the régime in the islands sometime in the Spring of 1784. In spite of a labored secrecy,²² rumors began to agitate the business men of Bordeaux in April. On May 12, 1784, Franklin wrote to the president of Congress²³ that "the court has not completed its intended new system for the trade of their colonies." On June 24, 1784, the deputies of commerce, to whom the proposed decree had been submitted, rendered their opinion that, in general, the interests of the colonies ought to be subordinated but not sacrificed to those of the kingdom, and in particular, that foreign salt meats should be excluded for the sake of Breton and Norman interests but that salt fish should be admitted as a necessity for the slave population.²⁴

²¹ Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Docs., É. U., 2:120. As the action of the French government which this letter might have influenced was the *arrêt* of August 30, 1784, this does not seem to allow sufficient interval for the operation of Morris's letter on so deliberate an organism. On the other hand (1) in May the government proposed to grant two free ports, (2) Morris proposed that all the ports should be free ports, (3) the *arrêt* granted seven free ports. Furthermore, at some time or other, the conclusions of Lafayette were carefully combined by some official hand with those of Barbé-Marbois and of Morris. (Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Docs., É. U., 2:100 et seq.) The absence of a date makes it impossible to say conclusively that this was done before August 30, 1784, but the fact at least adds to the probability that Morris's letter entered into the background of the decree.

²² "Lettre du Parlement de Bordeaux au Roi, 29 janvier 1785." *Recueil*, pp. 107-146.

²³ *Works*, (Bigelow ed.) VIII, 490.

²⁴ Arch. Nat'les., F⁷²².

On June 27, De Castries informed Lafayette that it would not be possible to embody all his proposals in the decree and, indirectly, that he (De Castries) was not altogether happy in dealing with a representative of the States who had only favors to ask and none to give: "the interest of our own commerce demands some consideration and I will treat fully on these subjects with Mr. Franklin and the Consul General of the United States."²⁵

Fortified by the opinion of the deputies of commerce and possibly influenced by Gouverneur Morris's letter, De Castries proceeded to the formulation of the *arrêt* and it was adopted in the Council of State, August 30, 1784.

The *arrêt* in the first place extended the number of entrepôts in the islands from two to seven. Santa Lucia was retained, and three others established in the Lesser Antilles, Saint Pierre for Martinique, Point à Pitre for Guadeloupe and its dependencies, and Scarborough for Tabago. The entrepôt at Mole-Saint-Nicholas was suppressed, and three new ones, Cap Francais, Port-au-Prince and Cayes-Saint-Louis were established for Santo Domingo. The list of permitted importations was also increased considerably as compared with the *arrêt* of 1767, by the addition of coal, which was perhaps not important, and of salt beef (salt pork was expressly excluded), salt fish, rice, maize and vegetables. The list of permitted exportations remained, as before, limited to molasses and rum, and goods from France. Importations and exportations were liable to a general duty of one percent, while salt beef and salt fish were charged an additional duty of three livres per quintal, the product of which was to be converted into a premium for the French fisheries. Elaborate regulations were provided to prevent fraud. Clerks were given the whole amount of the fines and confiscations which they brought about (Art. XVI) and even the merchants living in the ports were authorized to appoint representatives to participate in the visits of inspection (Art. VII). This emphasis on effective enforcement was carried out in De Cas-

²⁵ De Castries to Lafayette, June 27, 1784. *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States* I, 299.

tries' letter of transmittal to the Administrators. They were informed that their tenure of office would depend upon the absence of complaints from the merchants about the non-enforcement of the remaining restrictions.²⁶

The whole development of the proposal for liberalization seems to have been effected without any reference to the organized business interests of the community. When unofficial rumors growing in consistency down to the Spring of 1784²⁷ forced a reply, De Castries had at last responded to the inquiries of the shippers of Bordeaux by a statement that he had given orders to the Administrators of the islands to maintain the execution of the prohibitory laws.²⁸ This statement of facts was construed into a promise and used against De Castries in the protests against the *arrêt* of August 30.²⁹

The *arrêt* itself was not promptly published. Unofficial information about it seems to have reached Cayes by the end of September,³⁰ but official information reached Bordeaux only by the ministerial circular of November 13, 1784,³¹ which insisted equally upon exact enforcement of the new arrangements.³² When it was published, however, the *arrêt* evoked an immediate and voluminous protest. Although it would seem that only the interest of Bordeaux had been threatened seriously enough to evoke action in advance, the threat to the vested interests of commercial privilege brought protests from all the great commercial centers, from Bordeaux, Nantes, La Rochelle, Le Havre, Dunkirk and Marseilles, from Chambers of Commerce, directors of Commerce, from Parlements. Many of the protests were gathered together in a *Recueil des différentes pièces pour et contre l'admission des Étrangers dans les Isles françaises de l'Amérique*.³³

²⁶ *Recueil*, pp. xli-xlv.

²⁷ Texier to Vergennes, Bordeaux, July 29, 1783. Arch. Aff. Étr., Corresp. pol., f. U., 25:107.

²⁸ "Lettre du Parlement de Bordeaux au Roi, 29 janvier, 1785." *Recueil*, 107-146.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ "Mémoire des Négociants de Nantes", *Recueil*, pp. 1-29.

³¹ "Lettre du Parlement de Bordeaux au Roi, 29 janvier, 1785." *Recueil*, 107-146.

³² In *Recueil*, pp. xli-liv.

³³ For the use of this scarce collection I am indebted to Professor Charles H. Hull of Cornell University.

In general these protests restate in no very reasonable form the dogma of mercantilism, with no very close adherence to the facts. The memoir of the merchants of Le Havre is typical of the whole group and illustrates their general tenor. In summary, it declares (1) that the metropolis has the right to provide for the colonies and to take their products, (2) that the interest of the mother country ought to outweigh that of the colonies, (3) that the *arrêt* of August 30, 1784, violates sacred principles in admitting the foreigner, whereas French commerce has been and still is sufficient to the needs of the islands, (4) that competition by Frenchmen would be impossible because foreigners, especially the Americans, would sell at lower prices, (5) that the foreigners would not respect the restriction of their privileges but would undertake trade in contraband articles. Altogether these protests recall forcibly Napoleon's dictum that "French commerce was low spirited."⁸⁴

This is still further borne out by general lack of appreciation of the substantial opportunity for commercial conquest offered by the newly-opened ex-colonies of England. It did not enter at all into the appraisal of their situation by most of these master minds of French commerce. The merchants of Le Havre alone mention it, and only to dispose of it magisterially. "The prospect of making a general market for our dry goods throughout America by conceding complete freedom of navigation in our colonies to foreigners has a specious appearance: it is not new. The memoir in which it was presented on a previous occasion and of which the *arrêt* of August 30 seems to be a sequel was at least communicated to the business interests, who answered it successfully and relegated it to the limbo of such reveries as those of M. de Mirabeau's *Théorie de l'Impôt* and of the Abbé de St. Pierre."⁸⁵ The French merchant embattled in defense of his vested interest was not to be deluded by the vision of new worlds to conquer.

The protest of the Parlement of Bordeaux did not stop

⁸⁴ Pelet de la Lozère, *Opinions de Napoléon*, 239.

⁸⁵ *Recueil*, p. 158.

short of a formal reasoned demand for the reconvening of the States General. The merchants of Bordeaux seemed to have been particularly aggrieved by the secrecy with which the preparation of the *arrêt* had been surrounded. There was the evil of the system: the parties interested should have been heard.⁸⁶ "Will the legislative power of the monarch be less incontestable, less revered when the debates that can conciliate all the interests lead up to and determine all the laws. . . . Even Colbert deigned to call business men into his councils . . . but, of course, the ministry of Colbert was less distant in time than we from the States General where the citizen counted for something and could make himself heard in regard to his own interests. . . . How happily compensated would seem these moments of agitating alarms, if they might call back those ancient and solemn assemblages, too long suspended, the most beautiful achievement of the kings and the highest moment in the life of the people. . . . Under the least loved kings the States General have never cast a shadow of doubt upon the prerogatives of the Crown." Such were the stirring words with which the Parlement of Bordeaux announced the new program of the French bourgeoisie. Nor were they as a voice in the wilderness. Already Gouverneur Morris had said in that letter to the Marquis de Chastellux,⁸⁷ expressing his vigorous notions about Franco-American commerce, that in England commerce could overthrow the government, while in France the government could overthrow commerce. The merchants of Le Havre grumbled that when questions were submitted to those interested they were settled right. The anonymous author of *Réflexions sur le commerce, la navigation, et les colonies* (1787), emphasized the unrepresentative character of the control of French commerce as compared with the English system.

These manifestations are symptomatic. It is not necessary to suppose that we have here a complete demonstration that the Parlement of Bordeaux brought about the calling of the States General. Its demand for the calling of the States

⁸⁶ Letter of the Parlement of Bordeaux to the King, January 29, 1785. *Recueil*, p. 133.

⁸⁷ See above.

General is rather evidence of a breach of sympathy between the absolutism and an important element in the community which hitherto had been one of its main supports and which had derived valued benefits from it. It is perhaps worth noting, at the expense of some reiteration, that the breach arose not so much from the mistakes of the monarchy, in the academic sense, as from its perfectly justifiable efforts to shake off an outworn economic creed and to adjust its policy to the problems of the day.

The author of *Réflexions sur la commerce, la navigation, et les colonies* attacked the decree from a more rational standpoint, advocating a system that would contribute something to the increase of the national navigation. The realistically minded author of *Du commerce des colonies* (1785) supported it, although he pointed out that the colonists were not likely to buy bad Nantes flour at 40 livres the quintal when they could buy fine Philadelphia at 15 livres, nor the Americans to come to Bordeaux to take the sugar, indigo and coffee they needed.

The *arrêt* also failed to satisfy the Americans.³⁸ Jefferson and Lafayette attempted to secure more favorable arrangements in regard to flour and sugar but without result because of the continued clamors of the merchants.³⁹ As Jefferson pointed out, the United States was in a weak position in negotiating for commercial favors because the one consideration of value which the United States had to offer—admission to the American trade—had already been paid as the price of French aid during the war.⁴⁰

The united protest of the merchants was not without its effect, although the *arrêt* of August 30 remained. The merchants were so clamorous against the admission of the Americans, wrote Jefferson, that the ministers feared for their places.⁴¹ "Such clamors have been raised by the merchants against what we have lately obtained," wrote Lafayette to

³⁸ Otto to Rayneval, May 17, 1785. Arch. Aff. Étr., Corresp. pol., É. U., 29:270. See also E. Gerry to R. King, March, 1785. King, *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, I, 74.

³⁹ *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States*, I, 301-302.

⁴⁰ Jefferson, *Writings* (Ford), IV, 58.

⁴¹ Jefferson to Monroe, February, 1785. *Writings* (Ford ed.), IV, 31.

Jay,⁴² "that our efforts now must be directed toward holding it fast." The deputies of commerce, that interesting representative commission of which an adequate account is still wanting, constituted a reassuring bulwark against open reaction. On May 9, 1785, they presented an official opinion on the colonial régime that frankly envisaged a steadily increasing participation of the Americans in the trade of the islands.⁴³ The inability of French commerce to furnish the absolutely necessary supply of fish and of lumber and an adequate outlet for molasses and rum seemed to them to dictate arrangements that would permit the triangular trade contemplated by Barbé-Marbois.⁴⁴

The decree of August 30 was followed by two other decrees which make it difficult to estimate the exact consequences of the first. Apparently actuated by a desire to protect the fisheries from the consequences of American competition, the Council on September 18, 1784, passed another decree granting a premium of ten livres a quintal for all French cod carried to the West Indies.⁴⁵ According to Jefferson, this premium, combined with the duty in the islands, amounted to a prohibition of American fish.⁴⁶

The other decree, dated October 31, 1784, opened to the colonial trade all ports capable of receiving vessels of over one hundred fifty tons.⁴⁷ In contrast to the decree of August 30, it seems to have been generally approved⁴⁸ but it has the unhappy effect of rendering almost unintelligible two tables of the Bureau of the Balance of Trade purporting to show for the years of 1784, 1786, 1787, the business between the ports of the kingdom and those of the colonies in the materials of which the introduction into the colonies was permitted to foreigners.⁴⁹ No attempt was made to abstract the consequences of the decree of October 31, 1784, and the figures in

⁴² March 19, 1785. *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States*, I, 301-302.

⁴³ Arch. Nat'les. F¹³ 722.

⁴⁴ See above.

⁴⁵ Reprinted in *New Hampshire Mercury*, May 31, 1786.

⁴⁶ Jefferson, *Writings* (Ford), IV, 116.

⁴⁷ Arch. Nat'les. AF VII. 2a.

⁴⁸ Letter of the Parlement of Bordeaux to the King, January 29, 1785. *Recueil*, pp. 107-146.

⁴⁹ Arch. Nat'les., F¹³ 255.

individual cases show erratic variations up and down, but the total shows a considerable decline for 1786 and 1787 as compared with 1784. Another table⁵⁰ of the importations and exportations in the colonial free ports for the year 1787 shows only about 10,000,000 livres of importations from and about 7,500,000 livres of exportations to the United States. This was, of course, far greater than the figures for any other foreign nation, but only about one-sixth of the totals for France. What qualifications should be brought to these figures on account of the practice of contraband it is impossible to say, but since the principal objects of demand, sugar, flour, and fish, were the principal objects of contraband, they must be very considerable. On their face, however, the tables show what was expected before the event, a definite encroachment of American commerce upon the field which French commerce had been long accustomed to regard as peculiarly its own.

This situation was presently aggravated by the unforeseen resentment of the French government over the navigation acts of Massachusetts and New Hampshire. Although these measures, which laid a simple and not very heavy discriminatory tonnage duty on all foreign vessels, were directed primarily against England, Vergennes resented them, and they were taken as occasion for imposing new and burdensome regulations on the trade between the United States and the West Indies.⁵¹ These measures aroused great indignation in the New England States. Governor Sullivan of New Hampshire, usually Francophile, wrote to Otto that these regulations were incompatible with the spirit of the treaty.⁵² Rufus King retaliated in the Congress by holding up the ratification of the consular convention upon which the French government set great store.⁵³ The commercial acts of Great Britain and the *arrêts* of France on the codfishery tend to the same purpose, wrote King: "America begins to learn that she must

⁵⁰ Arch. Nat'les., F⁵ 256.

⁵¹ Jefferson to Adams, November 19, 1785. Jefferson to Lafayette, July 17, 1786. *Writings* (Ford), IV, 255 et seq.

⁵² May, 1786. Arch. Aff. Etr., Corresp. pol. É. U., 31:285.

⁵³ Otto to Vergennes, May 20, 1786. *Ibid.*, folios 320-324.

depend on herself for prosperity and happiness."⁵⁴ In 1787, another *arrêt* increased the duty on American fish and the bounty on French fish imported into the islands. Jefferson hoped that it would be evaded by the practice of putting American fish into the French fishing vessels.⁵⁵

It is not clear, however, that the political resentment in the American Congress at the French government's retreat from the decree of August 30 was based on actual loss of the profits of trade with the French colonies. To the French representatives in America, at least, it seemed apparent that great numbers of American vessels were engaged in a very active contraband trade with the French West Indies.⁵⁶ The French government attempted to utilize its elaborate system of consuls to erect a passport system, but this angered the Americans⁵⁷ without producing the desired effect in the islands, apparently because of a lack of coöperation on the part of the Administrators. A learned note from the Minister of Marine to the Administrators of the islands portrayed for these gentlemen, in all probability sufficiently well informed by experience, what the practices of the smugglers were. They were the old familiar devices which the American trader had learned in an old school, double papers and double captains, falsification of clearances both from the island ports and from American ports, dealings with inter-island and French vessels in neutral ports and even on the high seas.⁵⁸ It does not appear that the acquisition of this information by the Administrators led to any permanent improvement, although on March 7, 1787, the New Hampshire *Mercury* published as news the statement that American vessels at Port-au-Prince were being "watched so narrowly by French officers of the customs as to render their smuggling sugar and coffee wholly impossible. A French man-of-war sees them

⁵⁴ *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, I, 171.

⁵⁵ *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States*, II, 45.

⁵⁶ Petry, vice-consul at Wilmington, N. C., June 20, 1785. Arch. Aff. Étr., Corresp. pol., É. U. Supplement, 4:29; Ducher, acting vice-consul at Portsmouth, N. H., Sept. 1, 1786. Arch. Aff. Étr., unclassified; De Moustier, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corresp. pol., É. U., 33:33.

⁵⁷ Ducher, Consular Report no. 27, Portsmouth, June 1, 1787. Arch. Aff. Étr., unclassified.

⁵⁸ Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Docs., É. U., 14:431. Dated December, 1786.

clear of port and never fails to search them." De Moustier in 1788 found that smuggling had developed to such an alarming extent that he considered it impossible to stop it.⁵⁹

The question remained unsettled and disturbing down to the end of the old régime. De Moustier was warned in his instructions that the Americans would complain of the slight favor which their trade with the West Indies received, but he was directed to point out that everything had been done that was consistent with the interests of the King's subjects.⁶⁰ He found this program altogether inadequate in view of the insistent demand among the Americans, especially those of the South, for practically unrestricted trade and in view of the alarming extent to which smuggling had developed. He urged a policy of concessions, balanced by compensating concessions to French merchants for what they might lose.⁶¹ Even the satisfaction created by the formal *arrêtization* of Calonne's letter of October 22, 1786, was counterbalanced on the one hand by the demand for a market in the West Indies, especially for the admission of American flour and a direct supply of sugar and coffee, and, on the other hand, by the demands of the tobacco interests for more satisfactory treatment in France. By 1788, the Americans had become skeptical of the ability of the Monarchy to make good its generous intentions in view of the dogged opposition of the Chambers of Commerce and the refusal of the Parlements to register the edicts embodying concessions.⁶² De Moustier reported them impatient of any restrictions which the European governments had imposed on their trade with the West Indies and of distinctions between the mother countries and their colonies.⁶³

The desperate situation of the colonies and of France in 1789 resulted in a forced surrender to the Americans. A colonial *arrêt* of 1789 permitted the free importation of

⁵⁹ Bourne, ed., "Correspondence of the Count de Moustier," *A. H. R.*, 8:724.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 710.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 8:724.

⁶² De Moustier to Montmorin, July 5, 1788. Arch. Aff. Étr., Corresp. pol., É. U., 33:29.

⁶³ Memoir of De Moustier, Sept., 1788. Arch. Aff. Étr. Mém. et Doc., É. U., 7:65-155.

American flour until 1793, but this was revoked on account of the protests of the merchants and was continued only by temporary *arrêts* renewed from time to time.⁶⁴ The French consuls were busy urging American merchants to send flour and biscuits to the islands.⁶⁵ In the Constituent Assembly, the colonists protested against the continuance of the prohibitive régime,⁶⁶ but the Assembly⁶⁷ and also the Legislative Assembly failed to settle anything in regard to the matter of trade. Thus it was only at the outbreak of the war with Great Britain that any decisive action was taken; first, the Girondist measure of February 19, 1793, which established in law the admission of the Americans to the islands, and, in the second place, the Montagnard decree of September 11, 1793, which included the colonies within the national customs barriers.⁶⁸

The absolutism had repeated in the matter of colonial policy the pattern of its failure in regard to the tobacco trade.⁶⁹ Well advised and inspired by statesmanlike aims, it had attempted to reorganize the colonial trade in such a way as to bind the Americans to the French market by the ties of natural interest. It had failed to satisfy the Americans because the vested interests of the colonial traders made it impossible to permit the natural interchange of necessities between the colonies and the United States. On the other hand, the great merchants were alienated and irritated to the extent of lending their naturally conservative support to the opposition to the government and to the party of change. The semi-enlightenment of the monarchy, on the one hand, and its fettering entanglements with the historically founded interests of special privilege on the other, created a problem for which there was no answer save revolution.

⁶⁴ Jefferson, *Writings* (Ford) V, 419.

⁶⁵ Oster, consul at Norfolk, to the Minister of Marine, December 17, 1789. Arch. Aff. Étr. Corresp. pol., É. U., suppl., vol. 4, no. 97.

⁶⁶ *Apêçu sur la Constitution de Saint-Domingue*, par M. de Cocherel, l'un de ses députés. Arch. Nat'les. AD. VII, 2 b.

⁶⁷ Lafayette to Washington, March 17, 1790. *Mémoires*, II, 154.

⁶⁸ Nussbaum, *Commercial Policy in the French Revolution*, pp. 231, 234, 236.

⁶⁹ "American Tobacco and French Politics, 1783-1789," *Pol. Sci. Qu.*, Dec., 1925.

GEORGE N. SANDERS—AMERICAN PATRIOT OF THE FIFTIES

MERLE E. CURTI

Smith College

IT WAS a brilliant group of revolutionary leaders who enjoyed each other's company at the London house of the American consul on a certain February evening in 1854. Kossuth was there, piqued at his failure to enlist the United States on a crusade for freeing Hungary, whose rebellion Russian arms had just quelled. If his ardor for his "beloved, generous" Americans had slightly cooled with the dwindling away of the funds he managed to collect from them, still there was no harm in dining with their London Consul. Garibaldi was there, too, not yet seasoned by his red shirt exploits in Sicily, but still a respectably agile revolutionary. The distinguished Russian exile, Herzen, and Arnold Ruge of Frankfurt Parliament fame, gave *éclat* to that gathering. Then there was Ledru-Rollin, awaiting with eagle eye a chance to supplant the third Napoleon, and finally the great Mazzini himself.

James Buchanan, the American Minister to the Court of St. James, who was likewise a guest, supplemented the group. Doubtless he felt a little awkward at being surrounded by so many "reds," for he remarked to his hostess, Mrs. George N. Sanders, that he wondered she did not fear an explosion of all the combustible materials about her! Indeed, the very presence of the American Minister at this revolutionary banquet table was challenging. If Mr. Kellogg would search through the papers of a former secretary of state he would find how James Buchanan, on this and other occasions, served the cause of European radicalism while representing his country at London. He would find that his predecessor hobnobbed with exiled revolutionary leaders quite as dangerous in their day as those Mr. Kellogg closes the door to now. He would find Buchanan taking pleasure in honoring vanquished opponents of autocracy by dining with them. For Buchanan,

with most of his fellow-countrymen, sympathized at least in the abstract with liberal European movements, especially with the aspirations of suppressed nationalities. Thus he took no very great risk in attending this dinner, although it was well-known that his host, Mr. George N. Sanders, American Consul in London, had his heart set on engineering new revolutionary outbreaks in Europe. That is how it happened that his house was the chief rendezvous of the exiles in London who were plotting the revolution of 1854.

The volatile personality of George N. Sanders, of Carrollton, Kentucky, was such as to make him the hero of a melodrama. He was not an easy-going person. A minor politician, a wirepuller, he had never been quite able to arrive. He was a free-lance in politics. As early as 1844 he had flirted with the expansive and more liberal wing of the Democratic party, urging Calhoun to spare neither Texas nor Oregon. His political philosophy was largely that of the pioneer West,—enthusiasm for Democracy and a belief in the Manifest Destiny of his country. He liked to think of himself as a clever promoter. His enemies insisted that he used his influence with politicians to reap rich profits, yet much of the time he was in debt. His enemies, and they were numerous, assailed him for his activities as agent of the Hudson Bay Company. In adjusting its claims in the Oregon country they said he got handsome rake-offs. The more stoutly Sanders denied, the more bitterly he was assailed. His querulousness doubled his foes. One of them described him as "notoriously too lazy to shave and clean himself, and out and out a blackguard." Sanders came to be a sort of bull in the china shop which called itself the Democratic party. He denounced the old-line politicians as "old fogies" and "vile toads" speculating in the honor of the nation. Being thus alienated from them, he repudiated their "dullness, sloth and mediocrity." For him they were men with many ideas of a by-gone age. He especially despised their desire to keep the country isolated from the rest of the world. Sanders did not hide his dislike of "so beggarly a sire as fogydom." He felt it "pressing like a horrid nightmare upon the young and surging bosom of American democracy."

If this patriot had enemies, he also had friends. Nothing puzzled him, he never lacked for courage. He could endure any fatigue with a bonhomie none could surpass. He required little sleep if he could have large portions of strong meat and drink. It was said that he borrowed and spent thousands for champagne alone. With his great trunk, and his large massive head, his powerful features, abundance of dishevelled hair, and his radiant blue eyes, he was of striking appearance. His pleasant smile and speech put all his guests at ease. His relish of a feast encouraged everyone and even appeased those of his friends who had lent him money to provide the entertainment. In all these lavish affairs he was greatly aided by his wife, a literary woman who had edited a New York periodical. Sanders had conducted his courtship by correspondence and married the lady within a week after their first meeting. But even this felicitous marriage did not cause him to settle down. He determined to have revenge on his enemies, the old-line politicians, who had denied him a job and recognition. These Old Fogies were, as isolationists, opposed to the sentiment of aiding liberal European movements, such as republican and nationalistic uprisings. This fact gave George N. Sanders motive for favoring that policy.

As if by accident, Sanders' natural sympathies for liberty were confirmed and strengthened in still another way. Though he condemned before the people "the monied interests," he acted as the agent of one George Law, a capitalist engaged in the steamship business. He induced Law, it seems, to enter into a deal by which the United States War Department ridded itself of forty thousand antiquated muskets. Sanders supposed the revolutionary leaders in Europe would be anxious to get the rifles, and in 1848 he hurried off for Paris. It was said by his English friends that he lent a hand in the street fighting of the June Days, and even helped direct the construction of the barricades. Before leaving Paris, Sanders was given a popular ovation at the Hotel de Ville and his carriage was drawn by enthusiasts through the more democratic portions of the city. Unfortunately, however, the rifles remained his, as the revolutions were crushed

before negotiations for their disposal came to a head. Sanders now returned home thoroughly convinced that the United States must coöperate with the exiled revolutionary leaders in engineering a new movement for freedom! He made it his special mission to line up the country against "the iron tyranny and barbed tortures of the trembling coward, European Imperialism."

The times were ripe for such an appeal as Sanders could make. There had to be some outlet for the jingoism engendered by the Mexican war, a cheaply won victory which made the Southwest eager for more exploits. Cobwebs were collecting on the Stars and Stripes, said Sanders, and he would brush them off by inaugurating a crusade for European liberty, then suppressed by czars and despots. To Sanders even constitutional monarchy "stunk in the nostrils" of Heaven-blessed Americans. Webster had been applauded for his now famous spread-eagle letter to Hulsemann, the Austrian chargé, in Washington, a letter which expressed sympathy for the Hungarian anti-Hapsburg revolution and which proclaimed the glorious destiny of America as the torch-bearer of Liberty. Kossuth had aroused such popular enthusiasm that the New York *Herald* predicted Webster's appeal for aid to fallen Hungary would be the trump card to the White House. Though the *Herald* was mistaken, the campaign of 1852 showed such appeals would capture votes among the newly-arrived immigrants.

Sanders not only talked revolution, but took active steps to promote it. Why should not the country give gentle aid in the development of embryonic nationalities in the Old World? As a reward for this mid-wifely service there would be new opportunities for marketing the Mississippi valley produce which was expected to multiply with magic swiftness. Now that the English anti-corn laws were repealed and mid-western grain could find its way to British urban centers, why should the good work stop? To his big business supporters, such as George Law, Sanders suggested the possibility of new steamship lines for carrying produce to the ports of our proteges, who would welcome our commerce with open arms.

If a war for freedom in Europe meant increased American prosperity, what more could be said for it?

But George N. Sanders found much more to say for it. Apart from our moral indignation at the despotic acts which left "the beaten and lacerated peoples of Europe" almost hopeless, it was to our political interest to take up the cudgel against the autocrats. The States were trembling over the uncertain results of the Compromise of 1850. The tendency towards separatism was cropping up in unexpected ways. Upon what program could the country and parties so well unite as on the platform of intervening in Europe on behalf of liberal movements? Such a policy, a "progressive foreign policy" Sanders called it, would make the power of the United States felt everywhere. "Never was the opportunity, so magnificent, afforded to a people since history began, as that which seems proverbially presented to the young republic, which some would treat as if still in swaddling clothes, even now that it has reached the first phase of its giant manhood." This "progressive foreign policy" would dismay his ancient enemies, the Old Fogies. It would be welcomed by his allies the men of big business.

Suspected by the old guard in the Democratic party, Sanders turned to the man who seemed ideally capable of realizing this program. He turned to a man after his own heart, a young man, a man who had ambition, who had lavished promises of spoils to those who would follow his lead. This man was Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois, blatant advocate of his country's power, enemy of European monarchies, promoter of railroads and champion of all prospective capitalists. If a "progressive foreign policy" would reap advantages for American interests by securing new markets at the expense of the British, Douglas would take that turning. With a large foreign constituency who hated the European absolutism from which they fled, Douglas saw clearly enough on what side his bread was buttered. There was much to gain and nothing to lose by the gesture of tendering aid to European candidates for freedom. Hence he jumped at the bait which Sanders, lean and hungry and thinking too much, held

out. It was suspected that Douglas had an axe to grind when he outdid Webster at the Kossuth Banquet in January, 1852 in proclaiming the cause of European freedom.

Sanders and Douglas had in fact discovered each other in the spring of 1851 or thereabouts. The "Young Giant" of Illinois felt that the alliance bade fair for success. Sanders wrote a patriotic jargon which appealed. Everyone knew he was a manipulator in back-stairs politics who might do fearful and wonderful things. The very fact that he was distrusted by the diplomatic representatives of autocratic Austria and Prussia was a feather in his cap. For Sanders, on the other hand, Douglas was a "second Hercules" come "to clean the Augean stable, to hurl out the guilty, restore with a flood of Democratic power the purity of our institutions." Under his leadership the peoples of the world would become united against despotism and mutual justice would take the place of the supremacy of kings and races. Oligarchies were to be overthrown and "the law of brutal force abolished among men."

Presently Douglas was importuned by the quixotic Sanders to supply funds for the purchase of the *Democratic Review* which as the organ of "Young America,"¹ that is to say the Douglas movement, was to advance the politician's candidacy for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1852. Douglas pleaded poverty. But the *Review* was bought. The January issue startled everyone, including Douglas, for Sanders had let loose his fire. Under the thinnest veil he attacked the leading lights in the party, their imbecility, their "Quaker-like" policy, until Douglas' friends begged him to stop. Douglas himself tried to drop his pilot before his folly ruined him. He might as well have spared his words. Sanders was merely egged on to more rancorous onslaughts. He refused to modify his attacks one jot or tittle. He denied indeed the subserviency of the *Review* to Douglas or any other candidate. It had merely made a vow of literary chastity to "take to its fresh and virgin sheets none but those worthy of im-

¹ A detailed treatment of the movement Young America in which Sanders was prominent, is contained in an article by the writer in the *American Historical Review* for October, 1926.

mortality." So he spewed his venom, denouncing "Old Foggydom" as a "horrid and vile phantom . . . a grim and blowing spectre, its hoary hair streaming with the small devils of every political vice, a male gorgon; with legs lean and skinny, dangling on our sides, and fists like harpies claws."

Once having seized the hoary monster by the throat, Sanders meant to strangle him. He determined to strain every muscle to move America along with the world, to live up to the true American tradition by "pioneering for liberty" in the "yet unreclaimed forests of barbarism and tyranny." In the early months of 1852 Sanders gave himself up to bold schemes and yet bolder dreams. He concluded that the jingoism spending itself in filibustering expeditions for securing Cuba might be diverted to expeditions for freeing Italy and Hungary. No agent of Lenin could exceed his proselyting zeal nor his grandiose propaganda. Kossuth was told that friends of European liberty (were they the Laws?) would fit out a ship which would call for the banished leaders at London. Fully armed, they would be landed at some point or other on the Adriatic. To the ship would flock the cowed Hungarians, waiting only the leadership and apostolic blessing of America, and the antiquated Sanders-Law rifles! Kossuth took Sanders as seriously as Douglas had taken him. Sanders took himself most seriously of all. Fine days, those early months of 1852!

But Douglas was not nominated at the Baltimore convention of the Democrats that June. Nor was the money forthcoming to arm the ship for Kossuth, whose beseeching appeals for aid "before it was too late" came to sympathetic ears but helpless hands. But George N. Sanders was not the man to admit that everything was over. With Pierce elected, he began to manoeuvre for an appointment to a diplomatic post in Europe where he might hatch new plots for new revolutions. Day after day with his friends he besieged public men who chanced to drop into the Astor House in New York. He urged them to prevent the appointment of his arch-enemy, Marcy, as secretary of state. He interviewed the President-elect. With the aid of Law and Douglas a promise was

wrung from Pierce for some sort of a strategical post. Though Marcy was opposed, Sanders knew in November, 1853, of his appointment as consul to London.

Thus became possible the dinner party for the revolutionary exiles that February evening of 1854. The house of Sanders became their head-quarters. He secretly sent their communications to the continent in the dispatch bags of the American legation, though Minister Buchanan later plead entire ignorance of his proceedings. Besides, he wrote plain-spoken letters to the London *Times* advising the assassination of Louis Napoleon, "by any means, and in any way" it could be accomplished. In reckless fulminations he defied the European autocracies and prophesied a successful revolution that very year of 1854. His friend August Belmont, representative of the Rothschild's in New York, was encouraging Sanders in both his open and secret revolutionary activity. With rhetorical splendor Sanders issued a manifesto to the effect that the Porte was about to invite Kossuth to lead an army against Austria, unless that power should take a decisive stand in the fast-approaching Crimean war. He was urged by Kossuth to bring the Porte to such action by exercising pressure on the American diplomatic agent in Constantinople. That official refused to play with edged tools and so this scheme of Kossuth's and Sanders' was buried.

If Sanders could ladle out only minor dispensations, they were enough to annoy Austrian diplomats and to convince his enemies in the Senate that his appointment as consul of London must not be confirmed. This news set the London exiles on their ears. Kossuth expressed himself as being sick at heart on thinking what the cause of European liberty lost by losing Sanders. "My admiration rises to affection for you," wrote Victor Hugo. "When you write it is your soul that writes, a soul elevated and free." Mazzini and Ledru-Rollin joined Kossuth in addressing to him a letter expressing "deep regret and mortification at this untoward occurrence," and Garibaldi added his token of affection and appreciation.

But these commiserations, pleasant though they were, did not soothe the itch of defeat. Sanders heaped indignities on

Douglas who, he presumed, had left him in the lurch if indeed he had not double-crossed him. Douglas took pains to make it clear that he had staunchly defended his friend.

Though Sanders was to play a dramatic rôle in the Civil War as Confederate agent in Europe and as a delegate to the Niagara Conference which Horace Greeley arranged, his game for the time had played itself out. The millions of Europeans remained "bent down in servitude." Yet this knight-errant of American democracy has, apart from his picturesqueness, a significance quite out of proportion to his actual accomplishment. He was not a Wilson, failing because he did not know how to put lofty ideals into practice. He was a business man in politics. His associates were capitalists and revolutionaries. The former yearned for revolutions in Europe for the profit of their steamship lines, their surplus munitions and their prospective surplus of grain, the latter for more idealistic reasons. Sanders himself was both business man and idealist. He appealed in the name of the American eagle to the same interests which have often confused patriotism and gain. He was not ashamed to serve God and Mammon at the same time, for they were to him not irreconcilable. He anticipated others in trying to make the world safe for the sort of militant democracy most favorable to a speculation in futures. The interesting thing is that it was to promote revolutions that he connived with big business. These revolutionary activities were meant to spread our peculiar American doctrines of liberty in an unwilling and conservative Europe. They were meant at the same time to uproot the existing order and to spread the blessings of American civilization and produce. The methods Sanders employed were indeed so crude that they would make certain American patriots who have succeeded him blush. The methods of the patriotic business man of today are more refined—since the 'fifties Young America has grown older and more wise.

RUSKIN THE PROFESSOR

JASON ALMUS RUSSELL
Colgate University

PRESIDENT Ernest M. Hopkins of Dartmouth College recently addressed the students of Harvard University on the relation of college to life. In the course of his talk Dr. Hopkins stated that the poorest definition ever given for higher education was that of an ancient dean of Christ College, who, in recounting what its advantages were to a student, remarked:

"First, that he may be able to read the Scriptures in the original text; second, that he may be entitled to a proper contempt for all who cannot; and third, that he may be able to earn a larger emolument than his neighbor."

Against this novel and somewhat biased statement I am placing another definition of the educated man. Ramsay MacDonald, former labor minister of England, lately joined a group of "old students" at a workingmen's college in London, and discussed with them the real meaning of the acquisition of knowledge and "the educated man." According to this statesman, "the educated man is a man with certain subtle spiritual qualities which make him calm in adversity, happy when alone, just in his dealings, rational and sane in the fullest meaning of that word in all affairs of his life."

The President of Dartmouth, a man who is well-qualified as a leader of men, has added his interpretation:

"Such a man must have been humble in the presence of great minds and great souls, must have been simple in contacts with his fellows, and must have been indefatigable in his desire to cultivate and maintain the power of his mind and to accumulate that knowledge which makes up the data of accurate reasoning."

The reader of Ruskin will have no difficulty in formulating a definition from those of MacDonald and Hopkins, and in tracing the influence of the great teacher on the men of his and following generations. I will endeavor to draw a picture of Ruskin and show the way in which he attempted to inculcate

in his students the rules and precepts which, even in our present day, really train men. The process was because of the teacher and not in spite of him. For to him the object of learning was not only to perfect the faculties of human beings in order that they might be in sound and healthy condition, but also to balance properly the environmental and hereditary factors in life so that they might function efficiently toward God, their neighbor, and themselves.

Ruskin's Oxford Lectures were seldom true to their titles but were usually informal commentaries on his books and teaching, ranging over the whole field of human ideas, sympathies, and activities, without outward evidences of system, method, or logical guides.

On the surface he rejected all systems, philosophies, teachers, and antecedent knowledge except a few poets, the Bible, and many manifestations of Nature. Personally I feel that he based his philosophy on all knowledge, and then chose for himself the better things which he discovered in the great mass of material. "His Rule of Life is not too far beyond our reach, but as yet we have been unable to attain the goal to which he directs our attention. He is sensitive, moreover, to all forms of beauty, and has used his gift of the spoken and written language with courage and perseverance to exalt the whole field of morality, education, art, poetry, and religion."

In his speech, *The Mystery of Life and Its Arts*, he passed in review the hidden things of existence and chided mankind for its indifference to the purpose of living. Leslie Stephen, a distinguished critic, calls this lecture the most perfect of the great educator's essays, with its frank confession, melancholy conviction, and lack of satisfactory solution.

The composition teaches us that we need not remain in ignorance of the earth even if we do not believe in Heaven. Because the future is shrouded in darkness is no reason that we should follow the degrading path of the brute. Men should do the work of men and let the future take care of itself.

In 1868 Mr. Felix Slade bequeathed the sum of thirty-five thousand pounds for the endowment of professorships in Fine Art in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and in Uni-

versity College, London. He was a wealthy proctor in Doctors Commons as well as a great virtuoso and collector, and had taken a great interest in the project of a chair of Fine Arts—a matter which had been agitated as long ago as 1844, and on which Ruskin had looked with enthusiasm.

The Faculty of Oxford turned to John Ruskin as the man to fill the office with credit and distinction. He was elected in 1869, and reelected in 1873 and 1876. His work at the University is divided into two main periods: the First Professorship, 1870-1878, and the Second Professorship, 1880-1885. Incessant activity marked his work during the first years. Besides his regular lectures under the Professorship he published parts of works on geology, botany, and drawing. He contributed to newspapers on topics of the day. In *Fors Clavigera* he recorded many unspoken thoughts. And at Sheffield he founded a library of standard literature and a museum. He did not forget social experiments, particularly the attempted reformation of the standards and ideals of England through the Guild of Saint George.

Usually he arrived in the lecture-room carrying a pile of books containing paintings, notes, and anything which would excite the curiosity of his class. His dress was careless, but his personal interest in the men had more influence over them than neatness or subject-matter. His voice had an exquisite timbre and rhythm which was in perfect harmony with the medieval strain in his thought, and often held his audience breathless with its extraordinary modulations. No matter what he read, his physical presence, like that of Savonarola, actually seemed to be enlarged, and yet he always controlled his subject, never letting it manage him. Quotations from Homer and Chaucer he declaimed as no other man could, unless it were Gladstone, and of his own works he was the only adequate interpreter.

The lecturer, with his velvet college cap, light home-spun tweed, and ill-fitting old fashioned frock-coat—his face furrowed into sadness but lighted up by the fire of genius—resorted to various means to make the spoken word more effective. Sometimes he brought in a picture upside down in order to

pique the curiosity of the group and to arouse their interest. Again he would find fault with the vandalism of modern art. Once he held up on an easel a water-color drawing by Turner of an old stone bridge. Then taking his brush he sketched rapidly on the glass an iron structure, chimneys, clouds of smoke—all with the purpose of portraying "the triumphs of modern industry"—until not a trace of the Turner drawing could be seen.

"But, for my part", said Ruskin, taking his sponge, and with one pass of the hand wiping away those modern improvements against which he had inveighed in so many printed volumes—"for my part, I prefer the old."

One of his former pupils delights in describing the physical backgrounds of his lectures. The table in front of him and the walls behind and on the sides he covered with drawings, plates, and pictures. At the end of the period curious and enthusiastic pupils would rush to the front of the room to hear further explanations and criticisms.

Dr. Alfred E. Zimmern, a product of New College, Oxford, introduced the spell of this kind of instruction to America when he spent a year at Cornell University. I quote from an interview:

"You see, I spent a year at Cornell, learning the American student. . . . Well, we invited our students by dozens into our home. I said to them that I would not set them any subject for study; they should select a subject, go as pioneers to the library, search for the books that would be of assistance, and come forward with a thesis." The Englishman was highly enthusiastic over the results of his experiment.

Following Ruskin's Inaugural Address certain worthy persons protested to him against the use of irrelevant and Utopian topics on which he had spoken so freely. These topics, however, contained the very essence of what he wanted to say; and although he promised to take more care in the future yet he failed to reform, for, with him the teaching of art included all fields and vocations. He never forgot that his great mission was to claim for art its full place among the Humanities,

limited as that place then was by the commercialism of the outside world and the over-specialism of the University.

Now that he decided to come into closer touch with Oxford he applied for residence within the college and was admitted as an "honorary fellow". He brought a large part of his minerals, his books, and his art collection to his rooms. Then, on the advice of his friends, he instituted a series of breakfasts, luncheons, and dinners to which he invited students and other interested people to talk over the work and look at his treasures. His influence was stimulating in the highest degree among all classes of the University.

Many educators had felt that the English youth was wasting too much time and energy on athletics instead of experiencing the real aches of muscular labor. Ruskin took up this problem with zest. "Just as he illustrated a discussion of Greek Art by getting pupils to examine and handle the actual coins, so he desired to make them discover what the work of a day-labourer really was, and by some practical piece of serviceable toil, to come into personal contact with the lives of the poor and the conditions of rural life." This brings us immediately to the new road and the famous *diggers' breakfasts*.

The reformer had discovered a beautiful field near Oxford which carts were passing over and disfiguring with ruts. He succeeded in getting permission to rebuild the highway, and undertook to do it with student labor. Naturally this movement was cartooned all over England. The road never "held up" very well; but master and pupils had found out the worth of true labor and the amount of energy it takes to break stone by hand. An inch of practice is worth a yard of preaching. Thus Ruskin's theories were modified and tempered through practical experience.

This project had a deep influence on his later thought, and sowed the seeds of practical interest in social questions which led to the next Oxford Movement, and was indirectly responsible for the University Settlements in London, followed later by those in New York and Chicago.

Ruskin spent considerable time studying on the Continent, both in Italy, where the art of the great painters gave him an

opportunity to procure new lecture material, and in Switzerland among his favorite Alps. He tells us that he found that all Giotto's weaknesses were absences of material science, that the religion in him had developed all the faculties of his heart and hand, and that the human achievement and possession of his art were far above that found in the masterpieces of Titian. In the Alps he busied himself with sketches of the ranges and in leisure moments considered possible engineering projects to conserve the water wasted in the melting of the ice and snows. From observations made on this trip followed the lectures, *The Aesthetic and Mathematic Schools of Florence*, and certain talks on glaciers, which later were incorporated into a volume called *Deucalion*.

After the first lecture on Florentine Artists he wrote Mrs. Severn, in a note dated November 10, 1874:

"I've had a nice breakfast of my diggers, and gave the best lecture, everybody says, I ever gave in Oxford. They are wrong; but they 'know what they like,' and since it pleased them best I admit that, in a practical sense, it was the best. It *wasn't bad*, certainly! Then I went to my diggings, and accepted a challenge to use the biggest stone-hammer—and used it with any of them."

In May, 1875, Rose LaTouche¹ died and Ruskin sought comfort not in vain regrets but in earnest duty. More lectures followed on Florence and on the Alps, while he alternated work with study.

I now pass to the Second Professorship, 1883-1885.

Three distinct attacks of brain fever had weakened his constitution but, to a great extent, his vitality overcame the effects of the sickness. Yet he had not completely recovered and remained restless and irritable, finding difficulty in keeping to one settled train of thought or work. His physician advised travel; so he revisited his old haunts with his friend—and biographer—Collingwood, spending the fall and winter of 1882 in journeying from place to place.

Much to his delight and satisfaction he was reinstated as

¹ Rose La Touche, a drawing pupil who disappointed Ruskin by refusing to become his wife.

Professor at Oxford on January 16, 1883, and remained in that capacity until March 22, 1885, lecturing, advising the drawing school, and publishing further articles and books. He was now sixty-seven years of age and had earned sufficient fame. He had intended to remain at Oxford for the following term; but two matters brought his anger to a high pitch: the University refused to build a well-lighted room for undergraduates "apart from the obscure and inconvenient Ruskin School; and was unwilling to purchase for its furniture the two Yorkshire drawings by Turner of *Crook of Lune* and *Kirby Lonsdale*—grants instantly refused on the plea of the University's being in debt." Ruskin never visited Oxford again after December, 1884.

He defined his system of teaching in his *Inaugural Lectures*, setting forth schemes of work which are based on the assumption that Oxford is the home of disinterested study, which he found was not in accordance with facts. As I look through the five volumes of his collected Oxford Lectures, I am bewildered with the scope and breadth of his teaching. Lecture-titles furnished only a starting point. The end was never in sight when he began, for he preferred freedom of movement and variety of subject, constantly repeating and emphasizing old truths while bringing forward new thoughts and moral principles. They contain much of his matured thought on many artistic subjects, careful research, and ingenious and penetrating analyses.

But sometimes his thoughts employed neither sense nor reason, and it is well that we should not pass over this characteristic of his instruction; Thus:

"But what meaning has the iron railing; either observe that you are living in the midst of such bad characters that you must keep them out by main force of bar, or that you are yourself of a character requiring to be kept inside in the same manner. Your iron railing always means thieves outside, or Bedlam inside;—it can mean nothing else than that. If the people outside were good for anything, a hint in the way of a fence would be enough for them; but because they are violent and

at enmity with you, you are forced to put the close bars and the spikes on top."

Similar passages may be found dealing with power-driven machinery, factories, railroads, and any industrial improvements.

In conclusion, I quote from an able discussion of *Ruskin The Prophet*, by Mr. C. F. G. Masterman:

"If you want in a sentence to sum up all this wonderful story of the travail through a whole decade of man, entirely and unselfishly and disinterestedly preaching what he thought were the things which belonged to the peace of his nation, though it brought him no return, I think that you can sum it up in that declaration:

"'It becomes every hour more urged upon me that I shall have to leave—not father and mother, for they have left me: not children or lands, for I have none—but at least this spiritual land and fair domain of human art and natural peace in Italy—because I am a man of unclean lips, and therefore am undone, because mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts.'"

BOOK REVIEWS

A CENSUS OF BRITISH NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS 1620-1800. By R. S. Crane and F. B. Kaye with the assistance of M. E. Prior. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1927. 205 pp.

A GUIDE TO THE PRINTED MATERIALS FOR ENGLISH SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY 1750-1850. By Judith Blow Williams, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. 2 Vols., xxiv, 535, 653 pp.

These two bibliographies indicate a growing interest in the hitherto somewhat neglected study of the social history of England in the last three centuries. The work by Professors Crane and Kaye is exemplary. The compilers undertook a definite and limited task which it was possible to accomplish successfully; namely, to make a check list of seventeenth and eighteenth century newspapers and periodicals in the chief American libraries. They have added apparatus to show where the material is located, in what years it was published, and the newspapers and periodicals published in this period of which American libraries do not have copies. It only remains to extend the census to British collections and to correct the mistakes that inevitably creep into a work of so great detail to make this one of the most useful tools of the trade that can be put into the hands of American students of modern English history.

Of the two pretentious volumes by Dr. Williams, one is unfortunately obliged to speak with less enthusiasm. Granting that she undertook a task almost beyond the capacity of a single person to perform successfully in less than a normal lifetime, it would seem to have been more prudent to limit the undertaking than to perform it inadequately. Perhaps most persons who consult these volumes will find items with which they were not previously acquainted. The compiler has labored long and industriously and has brought together numerous titles. A director of graduate study in this field will hereafter be obliged to call this work to the attention of his students, but if he is wise he will do it with much preliminary explanation and many misgivings.

It is almost ungracious to be severely critical of a work which has cost so much pains and which will undoubtedly be of service to many students. But it seems to the present reviewer to be both unsound in its general conception and faulty in the details of its plan and in execution. In the first place, it is doubtful whether it is practicable to separate economic and social materials from those that would be used in a study of any other variety of history. In fact, Dr. Williams separates them only in her titles, unless we agree that such works as Dicey's lectures on the Law of the Constitution and Anson's *Law and Custom of the*

Constitution belong in the categories to which her volumes are presumably limited.

Furthermore, the reviewer feels keenly that the impression likely to be left on the student by the dates fixed for these volumes is calculated to add to his difficulty in understanding the changing economic conditions in England in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Almost every one of the scanty introductory paragraphs which the compiler has contributed tends to support this view. They would doubtless have been changed somewhat in content had she been more familiar with what took place in the first half of the eighteenth century. There is, to be sure, no reason why one who wishes to do it should not make a bibliography of English economic history for the century from 1750 to 1850; there would seem to be just as little reason for doing so.

Moreover, to be useful, a bibliography should be either severely selective and critical or else reasonably comprehensive and painstaking. This one is neither. Dr. Williams makes no pretension to comprehensiveness even after she has exorcised from the term "social" "the drama, art, music, science, literature, amusements, etc., studied for their own sakes." When, towards the close of the second volume, as sub-sections in "Section XV. Social and Economic Conditions and Movements", she finally reaches "Education" and "The Churches", it is only to confess that "the literature of the history of education during this period is very extensive, and only a small selection can be given here", while "the history of the Churches during this period is too long and too distinct a subject to be included here in detail." One would have supposed that these comparatively little studied topics deserved less cavalier treatment in a work devoted to "social" history.

Finally, the machinery of topical analysis is too much elaborated, and is applied in so haphazard a manner as to hinder the use of the book by those whom it was apparently designed to serve. After one has unearthed Blackstone's *Commentaries* in "Section XV. Social and Economic Conditions and Movements", sub-section "Crimes and Criminals", sub-section "Other Works", and learns that the special edition to be kept in mind in this connection is the two-volume one by W. C. Jones (San Francisco, 1915-16), he is almost reconciled to the earlier discovery that among the "Publications of the National Government" are such treatises as Anson's *Law and Custom of the Constitution*, Bagehot's *English Constitution* (New York edition), and Lowell's *Government of England*. Perhaps it is worth mentioning that a majority of the titles included in this section are not in fact publications of the government, while publications of the government are listed in other sections.

Had the compiler listed her titles alphabetically according to author, with chronological and subject indexes, and had she omitted the sentences of general comment on each item, which cannot in the nature of things be of much assistance to other students, and had she left out also the longer paragraphs with which she introduces the numerous sections, her book could easily have been compressed into a single volume and would have been more useful. In conclusion, though it is a small matter, one wonders why she elects to depart from the usual practice of indexing titled Englishmen under their names rather than their titles.

W. T. LAPRADE.

FOREIGN POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES, THEIR BASES AND DEVELOPMENT. By James Quayle Dealey. New York: Ginn and Company, 1927. viii, 402 pp.

The present volume represents an attempt to approach somewhat scientifically the foreign relations of the United States. It consists of two parts—Part I dealing with "Bases and Agencies" and Part II, which traces the "Development of Policies"—and twenty-three chapters. The work also contains a splendid "selected" bibliography and four maps, although the latter do not appear in the table of contents.

The first part of the book is a bit confusing. The territorial expansion of the United States, treated in the second chapter of this part, does not appear to fall within the classification of either bases or agencies. It seems rather to have been a *policy*. The same may likewise be said of certain other chapters in this portion of the work. The reader does not easily grasp the objective of the author.

With reference to Part II, however, it may be said, in general, that it is comparatively free from these obscurities. Even here, nevertheless, an occasional date in the chapter headings would have clarified the narrative; for the topical treatment has tended to confuse the chronology.

Perhaps these, after all, are not major blemishes. Both the contents of the work and the bibliography indicate that Professor Dealey is quite familiar with his subject. Those who are interested in principles and trends in our foreign policies will find his book well worth reading, and the bibliography alone should recommend it to anyone who is attempting to teach American diplomacy in our colleges.

J. FRED RIPPY.

THE SOCIAL ORGANISM AND ITS NATURAL LAWS. By Henry Rawie. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Company, 1926. 327 pp.

This book represents another of the large number of abortive attempts which have been made of late, with significant frequency, to

solve the problem of the relation of currency and credit to the productive and distributive mechanism of society. Significant, it may be said, because of the wide interest thus shown in a problem of such critical importance, rather than on account of any contribution which the authors of these essays have made towards a solution. It is a blood brother, for example, to *The Golden Crucifixion of John Bull*, by Thompson and Wakinshaw, which has appeared in the second edition in England recently, and to *World Reformation by Monetary Revolution*, by Samuel Bottomley, of the Martian Society. Its long-dead ancestors may have been the theories of over-production and under-consumption of Sismondi and Malthus. It is a cousin, many times removed, of Foster and Catchings' *Profits*.

It is of peculiar interest to note the present recrudescence, all over the world, of the movement for monetary reform which agitated the United States a generation ago during the heyday of Bryan and Free Silver, disturbed France during the time of Proudhon, and stirred England at the conclusion of the Napoleonic era, and during the subsequent Bullion Controversy of Ricardo *et al.* Thinking on the subject of currency and credit has always been stimulated after a period of currency inflation. But the bankers—and too often the economists, seeing only the obvious dangers of continued inflation, and lacking time and perhaps intelligence to create a scientific financial structure—have been constrained to combat error with error, and to end monetary uncertainty and unorthodox theorizing, at one blow, by a return to the crude, but somehow sufficing, gold standard.

In spite of their defeat, at least once a generation in some part of the world by the conservative bankers and the orthodox economists, the currency cranks have returned undismayed to the fray, whenever the situation in the economic world has given the slightest encouragement to an attempt to overturn the *status quo*. It must be admitted, too, that these fanatics may be pardoned for their refusal to know when they are whipped. For the economists have never met the issue fairly and squarely, but have preferred to take refuge under the tutelage of those who stood to lose if the existing system were to be crippled in an attempt to reform it, and to accept the easy honors awarded by them to the defendants of an archaic and inefficient system for a victory over its disreputable but sometimes brilliant calumniators.

The concepts and conclusion of *The Social Organism and Its Natural Laws* are bizzare and naïve. Profits consists of the price at which a commodity is sold less its labor cost. In order to have a proper system of currency and credit, there should be just enough cash to pay for

the labor cost. Credit should be limited to the amount necessary to provide for the profit element in value. Long term securities should be avoided.

No credit should be allowed to exist which owes its existence to land values. The author's acquaintance with contemporary economics may be measured by considering this gem: "The theory universally accepted by educated writers and investigators is known as the Labor theory of value."

Nevertheless the author senses some of the real defects in our financial organization. More and more the economists are driven to the painful duty of really investigating and analysing the structure and machinery of our currency and credit systems. Those annoying critics of the sacred gold standard, while they may never win the honor of having produced a workable scheme to remedy the defects in the system of money and banking, may well be accorded the order of merit in the future for having pricked the experts out of their complacent lethargy. It may be added that the ideas of this class of critics are after all as reasonable and as in keeping with the facts as the theories of many a textbook-writer on money and banking of ten years ago; and one might almost say, of some "economists" of the present.

C. B. HOOVER.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ABBÉ BAUTAIN. By Walter Marshall Horton, Ph.D. The New York University Press, 1926. 327 pp.

A philosophical study which begins and ends with the statement that its occasion was a suggestion from Professor Étienne Gilson of the Sorbonne has already by that acknowledgment commended itself to many readers. And the book lives up to its origin. Its subject is a little-known philosopher-priest, "the grandfather of French Catholic Modernism," in whose mind many important streams of thought and feeling met—Christian Neo-Platonism, the philosophies of Kant, Pascal, and Malebranche, French Traditionalism and German Catholic Romanticism, as well as the sciences of biology and psychology,—but a personality who at the same time would attract a novelist because of the dramatic intensity and crises of his career, his romantic friendship with Mlle. Humann, "the Alsatian Mme. de Staël," and the tragic failure of his ambition. In the handling of this material Professor Horton shows more literary power than most contemporary American philosophers possess, and his orientation of Bautain's philosophy reveals both learning and sanity.

Though Bautain's metaphysic in the course of its development shows

many "periods," and compasses the extremes of an irreligious and a religious philosophy, it nevertheless displays alike at beginning and end the temper that loves certitudes, absolutes, ultimates, and peace, and that is impatient of logic and proof. Whether he is a Fichtean, standing on the individualistic basis of the transcendental ego, or the most Catholic of all philosophers, the corner-stone of whose doctrine is humility, he always emphasizes the irresistibility of the evidence of immediate experience, the unreality of syllogistic demonstration, and the dynamic character of reality and mind. The famous "Philosophy of Action," set forth by Maurice Blondel and expounded and taught by Laberthonnière and Le Roy, is his spiritual child, and Bergson's creative evolutionism and American pragmatism are his kindred. But though Bautain's voluntarism is interesting because of these connections and because it can be perceived as the necessary postulate of his religious metaphysic, it is his pan-vitalism, I think, which is the "mother-idea"—to use a favorite expression of his—of his system, and the fresher aspect of his total view. Many a philosophical system has relied largely on the category of "life," but Bautain's is differentiated by the effect of his study for the degree of doctor of medicine—his actual observation of the growth of an embryo. Life, then, for him did not hint vaguely at some Romanticist's universal energy; its reference was primarily to the physical facts of the origin and growth of the human organism. All change and growth in the world were for him traceable to the "va-et-vient" of active divine life stimulating and winning a response from passive being.

For the general American reader the greatest value of the book is, however, not the exposition of this complex, synthetic, and sometimes fantastic, philosophy, but its intelligent presentation of the speculative breadth of French Catholic Modernism—a notion which has been curiously slow in breaking in upon our minds. After quoting a Catholic apologist as claiming that "the authority of the Catholic Church rests upon the fact that it is the heir of all human tradition, and teaches a completely comprehensive and universal faith," Professor Horton goes on to say: "How plausible this contention is, may perhaps be indicated by the recent remark of a Protestant student of comparative religion: that Catholicism has absorbed so many diverse elements in its long development that it has become the epitome of the whole history of religions, from primitive folk-religions up" (p. 22). Beside such illuminating generalizations, the author gives occasional sympathetic views from the inside of Catholic psychology, such as one finds also in Paul Sabatier's *France Today, Its Religious Orientation*. For example,

how are we to understand Bautain's meekness when he was required to sign a thorough-going recantation of his deepest convictions? Professor Horton remarks that to non-Catholics such an act of submission is always a mystery. He then explains that to a Catholic, a Protestant appears grossly to exaggerate the importance of personal conscience and reflection. For a good Catholic the primary intuition is of the humble place of the individual in the universe and in his religious milieu.

KATHERINE GILBERT.

RURAL LIFE AT THE CROSSROADS. By Macy Campbell. New York: Ginn and Company, 1927. x, 482 pp.

ADULT EDUCATION. By Joseph K. Hart. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1927. xiii, 341 pp.

These books are quite different in method, point of view, and conclusions, but are alike in being thoroughly didactic, in being primarily adapted for use by reading-circles or other discussion-groups, and in using the Danish folk high-school to point a moral for American education. The premise for the moral in each case is that education in America has become almost, if not wholly, a matter of schooling. On this premise, however, Professor Campbell argues that what is necessary to be taught must be taught in the schools, while Dr. Hart argues that to make real education possible we must extend education beyond the schools and deal with adult minds; and each goes to Denmark to prove his contention.

Rural Life at the Crossroads, by Macy Campbell, of the Department of Rural Education at Iowa State Teachers College, is a logical exposition of the thesis that unless America is to have a farm peasantry, resulting from the farmer's utter failure to understand the necessity for coöperation with his fellows, coöperative marketing must be taught in the schools. The schools must teach coöperation to the children if coöperation is to be learned in time. The style is direct and earnest, and there is no attempt at smart writing. The facts in the relative decline of agriculture in America are admirably marshalled in support of the fundamental thesis. According to the vogue in discussing coöperative marketing Danish experience is cited, but the author sets forth with equal care American experience and conditions and the attitudes of American courts and legislatures. The closing chapters of the book discuss the transportation of children, financial support, and other problems of the rural school: since the school is the only hope of rural life, the rural school must itself be strengthened.

Adult Education, by Joseph K. Hart, associate editor of the *Survey*, deplors the fact that education has become more or less identified with schooling and therefore confined almost exclusively to the period of childhood and youth. The author states that our adult generations have "pretty nearly 'dug themselves in' behind their barricades of folk-way mind, orthodox creed, 'established knowledge', and vested ignorance." He argues that the child has no chance to change this state of affairs, for the child is under control of his elders, who mould him according to their ideals until he in turn takes over the task of moulding those who come after him to "his provincial mindedness, his animistic prejudices, his narrow customs, his obsolete habits." The social mind is not only static; it is paralyzed. Our current educational psychology is false in that it seeks to shape the child's attitude to one of conformity with preconceived standards fixed by adults. American pedagogical thought has been dominated successively by John Locke, Herbart, and Thorndike, each of whom has stressed the "giving" of information and other materials formulated or organized by adults, the choosing and arousing of "interests" and "ideals proper to childhood," and the like. Self-determination has not been considered. The author emphasizes his point by stating that Thorndike "got his theory of learning primarily from his studies of animal intelligence" and makes of learning "an externally-motivated process of taking on habits without being aware that they are being learned," some one else choosing the habits for the one who is to have them.

Up to this point Mr. Hart's text is a somewhat smartly written and stimulating, although at times needlessly caustic, re-vamping of the theory popularized by Rousseau, that children are in danger of contamination, or at least of serious warping, by their elders. The logical conclusion would seem to be that of Rousseau, that the child should grow up in a state of nature with as little association with adults as possible. Mr. Hart, however, does not seem to object to the child's being shaped and moulded so long as he is cast into moulds that have not come out of the past. He writes entertainingly that "psychology is *not now and never will be the basis of education*. Education is *social*, not merely intellectual; it is of the *whole* of experience, not merely mental; it is of the community, not merely of the individual. The basis of education is community experience, just as the basis of a corn crop is the soil." This all seems quite true, but it might be suggested that community experience goes far back of the present into folkways and other ways established before this generation, even as the soil is the

product of the wear and tear of geologic ages: a corn crop that had to create its own soil from original rock would seem comparable to education based upon immediate community experience divorced from any shaping influence from the past. But Mr. Hart's conclusion goes on to provide that some wise agency should make "the most comprehensive study and analysis of community life ever undertaken" and determine some vital form of education, varying according to the needs of different communities, suitable for young adults; that is, young people past school age up to thirty years of age. "Happily, such educational surveys are now being proposed and undertaken, here and there, in progressive cities."

Three questions, at least, are suggested by this happy conclusion. First, what guarantee have we that the wise people who make these comprehensive studies and analyses will not impose their ideas and ideals upon the plastic young adults and propagandize them? Second, how are we to choose these wise agencies apart from our prejudices of "folkway mind, orthodox creed, and 'established knowledge,'" so that we may unfailingly start with the wisest agency for the task and thereby avoid poisoning the stream of wisdom at its source? Third, assuming that children and young people are so thoroughly indoctrinated in our present schools as Mr. Hart seems to suppose, what hope have we of breaking their well-organized habits of docility after they have become young adults? Apparently Mr. Hart's remedy merely organizes them for further propaganda. It might be better to take the child while he is in school and add one more habit or ideal to those he must now acquire, the habit of fair investigation or the ideal of open-mindedness. This would seem a better means of achieving the desired end.

The author evidently feels the vagueness of his remedy for existing ills, and he attempts to propose a specific remedy by declaring that the Danish "people's high schools" represent precisely the sort of thing he advocates. His story of the accomplishments of these schools is well done, and probably unexaggerated, but do the "people's high schools" represent a freeing of the adult intelligence of Denmark from the pernicious effects of controlled education? They undoubtedly represent vocational education of a high order, that probably has many suggestions to our vocational educators. They undoubtedly have been a productive economic and social force. But have they not been essentially the product of Danish "folkways" and traditions, specifically have they not been a natural outgrowth of the European two-class educational ideal, a form of extension training very carefully planned and carefully supervised for those whom their superiors do not desire to participate

too actively in affairs of mind or state? Intensive vocational training is no doubt good, and it can doubtless be acquired best after the young adult has chosen his vocation and in a special school, just as vocational training for the professions has been acquired for centuries, but what has all this to do with broadening the meaning of education beyond mere schooling, or with getting away from Thorndike's or any other accepted psychology? Mr. Hart apparently extends education merely by adding another school, without showing that accepted psychologies will not dominate the additional school.

But it is really not quite fair to treat Mr. Hart's popularly written treatise as a book in the strictest use of the term; his material is really a series of cleverly written chapters that are elaborated editorials, vigorously phrased, to protest against certain more or less accepted weaknesses in American education. When his treatise is considered in this light, the author, in spite of the *non sequitur* of his proposed remedy, has produced a highly remarkable work that should at least cause the thoughtful teacher to inquire whether he is training the students in his classroom to think independently and helping them to develop varied interests that will carry on.

HOLLAND HOLTON.

THE LAST SALON: ANATOLE FRANCE AND HIS MUSE. By Jeanne Maurice Pouquet. Translated from the French by Lewis Galantière. With an Introduction by Montgomery Belgion. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1927. xxiv, 362 pp.

ANATOLE FRANCE THE PARISIAN. By Herbert Leslie Stewart. New York: Dodd, Meade and Company, 1927. xiv, 394 pp.

The Last Salon, written by the daughter-in-law of Mme. Arman de Caillavet, consists largely of family letters with just enough explanation to give proper connection. It is a biography of Madame Arman, ending with her death in 1910. But it is more. It shows a nineteenth-century salon, with the figures of Dumas fils, Commandant Rivière, Pailleron, Arsène Houssaye, Guillaume Guizot, Lemaitre, Hervieu, Marcel Proust, Charles Maurras, Lavedan, Mme. de Noailles, Jacques Coulangheon and others passing in and out.

In 1883 Anatole France and Jules Lemaitre were presented to Mme. Arman. She liked Lemaitre, but for a long time showed none but a sarcastic interest in France. In 1885 she said: "I like his style and his mind; I like neither his disposition nor his manners." Lemaitre kept urging the merits of his friend and by 1887 she thought enough of him to invite him to bring his wife and daughter to Capian, her country

place in the Gironde. She did not like Mme. France, for she wrote: "I saw the Anatoles Saturday evening, he trembling and stammering as usual in the presence of his imperious spouse. He had made a little plan for our joint departure which she demolished immediately. I shall let them go down by themselves. They are probably very upset, for since then I have made no attempt to communicate with them." Mme. France evidently reciprocated the feeling, for the melodramatic incident which brought about her separation and divorce arose over the attempt of Anatole to hang a piece of Genoese velvet given him by Mme. Arman.

From this point the letters show Mme. Arman urging France to agree to write a weekly article for *Le Temps* and helping him gather material for the seven books which he now produced in five years.

Mme. Arman's letters to her son Gaston, the playwright, depict her as a hard taskmaster, and we have ample evidence of the way in which she continually prodded Anatole France. Her son said when he left school: "Mamma has the soul of a schoolmaster (*pion*); she is never satisfied until she is making somebody work. It used to be me; now it is M. France." And two days before her death she said of her granddaughter: "Simone! . . . Yes . . . I might have taken her in hand, too, made her work . . . as I did the others. . . . But I am too old."

France owed a great deal to Mme. Arman and he recognized the debt in the presentation copies he sent her, but in later years her yoke weighed upon him, and he showed irritation and weariness with her exactions. He has been accused of ingratitude toward her—rather unjustly, I think.

The information in this book about the domestic troubles of the Frances is given to Mme. Pouquet by Mme. de Martel ("Gyp"), and it is evident that she is able to furnish a great deal more material on the subject. Mme. Pouquet tells us further that she has used here only a portion of her mother-in-law's letters that she possesses. In fact, the book is almost as eloquent in what it conceals as in what it relates. In the letters given there is nothing to show that the relation between France and Mme. Arman was anything but platonic. The Dreyfus Affair and France's entrance into politics—said to be largely due to Mme. Arman's influence—are practically ignored. There is no information about Mme. Arman's childhood or family, though there is much about M. Arman de Caillavet and his family. If the letters omitted deal with these subjects, Mme. Pouquet has another interesting book to write.

Professor Stewart's book covers much the same ground as Cerf's *Anatole France: The Degeneration of a Great Artist*, but it has the great advantage of treating the subject dispassionately. The method is much

the same—analysis of the works and deduction of the author's views from the sentiments expressed by the characters, supplemented by information gleaned from the various memoirs that have appeared since France's death. Stewart treats with Anglo-Saxon severity France's attitude towards chastity and religion, but he has nothing to say about degeneracy and allots him a respectable place among the immortals.

He has used to advantage the recent works on France, but unfortunately does not seem to know Mme. Pouquet's book; though the material found in it would have been very valuable to him. He dismisses the friendship with Mme. Arman de Caillavet in two brief references, minimizing the part she played in France's success and not even mentioning her by name. One is rather amused by his reference to France as a "tireless worker," all the evidence being to the effect that a great deal of moral suasion was necessary to get him to write.

In discussing France's attitude toward the Dreyfus Affair and the Separation Law of 1905, he shows a slight bias in favor of an established Protestant church, a limited monarchy, and religious instruction in the public schools, but he is so moderate in this that he will not offend any but the most extreme radicals on the subject. Others will be grateful for his judicious statements of the conflicting points of view.

The two books are admirable of their kind and taken together will serve the general reader as a fairly comprehensive introduction to Anatole France and his works.

F. A. G. COWPER.

A WILTSHIRE PARSON AND HIS FRIENDS. *The Correspondence of William Lisle Bowles.* Edited by Garland Greever. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927. xiv, 207 pp.

The figure of the Reverend William Lisle Bowles, the poet, emerges from the eighteenth century, drawing to himself by his mild piping, his subdued emotions, and his naïveté even less attention now than he aroused in his own time. Bowles was a well-educated son of the country clergy and moved in that rich episcopal atmosphere found in the better-to-do rural rectories, flavored somewhat by the great manor house in the offing—in Bowles' case, by Bowood, seat of the Lansdownes. In this setting—"a perfect paradise of a place," Coleridge described it—Bowles carried on his parochial duties, composed fresh, fragrant, and unimportant verse, wrote county histories, and corresponded with many eminent writers of his day: Moore and Crabbe (his neighbors), Southey, Murray, Sheridan, Rogers, and Coleridge. On this last person Bowles wielded a remarkable influence. Coleridge, as a youth,

worshipped Bowles and got from him an impulse toward poetry which for a time won him from his metaphysical pursuits, and which did not fail him in that springtime of his genius until he had written imperishable verse.

Bowles was a timid man—nay, a coward. He is said "at one time to have lived in such fear of mad dogs as to wear stout overalls to prevent being bitten"; and Southey reported that Bowles "was literally afraid of everything." His timidity, however, did not deter him from engaging in one of the greatest literary rows on record, the so-called Bowles-Byron controversy, which was waged over the merits of Pope—Bowles condemning and Byron defending. Bowles conducted himself in a gentlemanly way, and for the most part, so did Byron, but the latter's allies lowered the tone of the discussion to that of bitter personal abuse. The stand that Bowles took is representative of the opinion of the romantic generation toward the poetry of the Age of Reason.

In the appendix to this volume, Mr. Greever has included matter which is of really prime importance and interest. In the course of his researches he unearthed four reviews written by Samuel Taylor Coleridge between the years 1794 and 1797, which reveal the poet's astonishing critical maturity while he was still an undergraduate at Cambridge. The two most important critiques are those dealing with *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and Lewis's *The Monk*. The others are on Mrs. Radcliffe's *The Italian* and Mary Robinson's *Hubert de Sevrac*. Some specific influences on Coleridge by the Gothic novel are noted by Mr. Greever and are utilized, it may be added, by John Livingston Lowes in his recent masterpiece of Coleridgean scholarship, *The Road to Xanadu*. The reviews by Coleridge, at the same time, show his growing disillusionment with the unnaturalness of the Gothic romances, and we see him longing for the verities of Fielding and Smollett.

Mr. Greever has ordered his material and performed his duty as editor of Bowles's letters with deftness and even with a rarer virtue, grace.

LEWIS PATTON.

THE ROAD TO XANADU. By John Livingston Lowes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927. xiv, 639 pp.

Notice of a new book is often somewhat stale in a quarterly; and the latecomer, while he has the advantage of others' opinions, is so far forth handicapped in the expression of his own: let him add something if he can. *The Road to Xanadu* has been universally greeted with enthusiastic praise,—except by the writer of the first review which came

to my attention; and he was quite frankly puzzled by the book's enormous erudition. He stammered a bit and gave it up.

This *magnum opus* (it is great in both senses: it contains about 185,000 words of text and over 150 large pages of notes in nine-point type set solid, besides the illustrations) is made of four parts, each elaborately worked out: a study of the sources of *The Ancient Mariner*, a study of the poem *qua* poem, a study of Coleridge as a speculative aesthetician, and (the subtitle of the book) "a study of the ways of the imagination." These are sometimes kept distinct, sometimes fused, and sometimes juxtaposed. As Professor Lowes tells us, the work was a growth,—and it grew, as a tree grows, in many directions. Its roots are, of course, the indefatigable pursuit, underground, of the language and ideas of *The Ancient Mariner*. From this *quellenforschung* we emerge into open air with the poem itself, which for most students would constitute the aim and end of such a close application to sources. But Professor Lowes pursues his purpose (if I may pursue the trope) into the upper air, the cloudy region, using the poem and its roots for a study of Coleridge's mind in its many ramifications. Here he has gathered in and absorbed, with the same industry as that devoted to the sources, and here we can still follow him. And I venture to hold that this is the most valuable and important part of the book. But Professor Lowes will not leave us with a bare wintery tree. He follows upward and gives us what gives the tree one of its greatest beauties, the very foliage, with sunlight gilding and occasionally moonlight silvering the many leaves. Here he touches the sky, and here we lose him. We lose him in high speculation on the ways of the imagination. But if he also is lost, it is not without his own awareness of his condition.

Throughout the book there is abundance of fine enthusiasm over the mysterious beauty of the poem, of penetrating analysis of whence that beauty sprang, of fresh metaphor of the sea change and the rich welter of the subconscious (along with the famous alembic of the imagination); but are we really any wiser regarding the great mystery? As he is well enough aware, Professor Lowes has undertaken the impossible. No wealth of enthusiasm, no power of analysis, no accumulation of learning will break down the *inscibile* of "*imaginatio creatrix*."

Perhaps it is ungracious to lay emphasis on what is not done in the presence of so much that is brilliantly achieved. Practically every clue has been followed, through which Coleridge's enormous storehouse of images might be made plain; practically every image has been tracked not merely to its lair, but to a dozen lairs. Practically all that the omnivorous S. T. C. poured into his capacious subconscious has been

poured out again, sifted and rearranged, with an industry and clarity that would have staggered S. T. C., and exhibited in six hundred pages with cheerful and contagious energy. All the long road has been blazed and cleared through devious jungles and over stony soil with indefatigable zeal—let the reader follow as he may!—and if it does not bring us to Xanadu . . . we may relish the fine irony of the title.

The poet gathers in from all his varied experience of men and nature and books a vast accumulation of words, images, ideas, and what-not. Then something happens, and he brings forth a choice selection of them in the visible form of beauty. This we all knew before. What it is that happens, or how, remains unknown. There is no chemistry (as yet) of the creative imagination. But though we knew the general formula before and though we remain as ignorant as ever of the mystery, we had never been able to see the visible processes with such a wealth of illustration as Professor Lowes has lavished on *The Ancient Mariner*. This is his contribution; this and the astonishing skill with which the infinitely varied and variegated material—from daemonology and divination to the physeter and Erastus Galer's hat, with cluster points, the sources of the Nile, and credibilizing effects thrown in—has been moulded and held together.

PAULL F. BAUM.

CHINESE FANTASTICS. By Thomas Steep. New York: The Century Company, 1925. viii, 223 pp.

"High overhead flew a flock of pigeons, each of which carried on its tail a bamboo whistle." This is one of the "fantastics" with which the author has filled his book. He must have carried a notebook around with him and put down all the curious and interesting things which struck his fancy, and without very much rhyme or reason tossed them into this volume. The impression one gets is that China is a strange place filled with strange people who act in very strange ways. But it is not China alone; he tells us about Kudan, the pipe-seller, on the Ginza, in Tokyo, and Singapore and its wild-animal street. He has roamed all along the east coast of Asia as well as here and there in China. He tells us something about Macao, Nanking, or Central China; and Tsingtao, Teutsui, Peking, in the north—a little here and a little there. Occasionally there is a chapter on one subject or person, one of the best being that of an old Empress Dowager, but in the main it is a series of bee-like visits to one flower after another, leaving most of the honey still there. It is pretty and graceful, light and fetching, with some information and amusing bits of Chinese topsyturvydom; and that is

about all—but that is probably what the writer intended. We may very well take it for that, enjoy it, and lay it down to take up something more serious.

EDMUND D. SOFER.

THE WANDERING SCHOLARS. By Helen Waddell. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927. xxviii, 292 pp.

Miss Waddell's opening chapters contain a review, rapid and pointed, of the final decadence of Roman literature—a literature not without a kind of beauty, energy, and promise—when the grandeur had quite died away and its echoes sought ineffectually to blend into a new music. We may call the period the Dark Ages, but Miss Waddell shows it full of light and color and variety, even at its darkest, in the tenth century. By the year 1000, when the end of the world was so confidently expected, what was best of the old world was almost dead and the new (the Middle Ages) was yet struggling to be born. A renaissance was due, and it came in the twelfth century; to be followed in turn by decay and another awakening in the fifteenth century. This regular decline and renewal, a seasonal function of human development, is easy to observe through the distance of perspective, but Miss Waddell's distinction is an ability to keep a firm hold on the details while tracing the general movement. Through a long series of concrete facts and individual poets and "scholars" we follow the plotted curve,—as the unified spirit of Rome is broken up, scattered in various centers over Europe, those centers (the monasteries) sacked, the scholars set wandering, and new centers formed in the twelfth century; through these changes, the humanistic trend, the enjoyment of learning for its own sake, and the realism of poets who saw and felt and lived, comes in conflict with the centripetal forces of the Church,—the whole variety producing strange harmonies and stranger dissonances.

It is the wandering scholars who were poets that the book is chiefly concerned with, the Goliards, the *vagi*, who set down their "vernacular" experience of spring and moonlight and gay girls and sweet wine and roasting goose, in Latin verse, the language of the Church and of the learned. Most of them are innominate; they have left their songs (sometimes a little coarse, sometimes very lovely), not their names. Later they became the troubadours and trouvères and wrote in the vernacular; but these earlier poets had the peculiar status of semi-clerics; they belonged and they did not belong; a guild of often excommunicated outcasts who wandered because they enjoyed wandering and sang because they delighted to sing.

Miss Waddell writes in a style of considerable verve and beauty. This beauty may indeed at times become a little tiring, and at times approach facetiousness and suggest strain. But it is apparently without affectation and rarely partakes of that deplorable and latterly much cultivated habit of trying to disguise scholarship with the rouge and lipstick of melodramatic brilliance. Miss Waddell is always happily conscious of the humanness of the Dark and the early Middle Ages; she impresses us finely and fully with the fact that these men, to most of us hardly even mere names, lived and moved and had their being in a world not greatly different from our own, a fact too often overlooked by the professional scholars. But to call Charlemagne "that Athenian lover of strange things", to introduce Thomas Hardy and Paul Morand and Dostoevski (not too pertinently) savors of insisting too much. Now and again she will not let backgrounds be backgrounds, but must drag everything down to the footlights; and the glittering pageantry of names becomes dazzling rather than illuminating. She "corruscates on every page" (as one enthusiastic reviewer has it). But this is after all a lesser fault, when one considers the necessity of persuading a sceptical generation, exalted with its own progress and excited by its own noise, to hear the distant music of a too forgotten past. There was so much to recall, so much to declare, so much to make living, and withal so much downright erudition to be buoyed up with the spirit of life, that some exaggeration may have been needed to achieve the end so brilliantly achieved.

"Let all who have not already loved the Middle Ages read this book," says Professor Saintsbury; "and let those who have loved them read it, to love them again." The work was undertaken by Miss Waddell as an introduction to a collection of that large body of Latin verse so generally disregarded by the classical scholars because it is not classical and by the modern scholars because it is Latin. The introduction outgrew the book, but the book is (we hope) soon to follow. Certainly the way is admirably prepared for it.

P. F. B.

Duke University

ARTS AND SCIENCE · LAW · EDUCATION

RELIGION · ENGINEERING

6-43

Full Opportunity for Graduate Study
and Research

6-43

Summer Sessions

For Information Address

R. L. FLOWERS, Secretary

DUKE UNIVERSITY

DURHAM, N. C.

THE OLDEST BANK IN DURHAM



THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF DURHAM

Privileged to be of statewide service in commercial banking, in the execution of wills and trusts, and in the transaction of all phases of modern banking matters, will welcome the addition of new friends to its thousands of patrons.

Capital \$600,000.

Surplus, Reserves and Profits \$550,000

FOR SERVICE

Electric Light and Power

Street Railway Transportation

Electrical Appliances and Installations

Ice and Cold Storage

Telephone F-151

3

DURHAM PUBLIC SERVICE CO.

WANTED: Following back numbers of the
Trinity College Historical Papers: Series 1 and 8
(we will pay \$1.00 per copy). Series 5 (we will
pay 75c per copy). Will also purchase any issues
of *South Atlantic Quarterly* previous to January,
1911.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS,
Durham, N. C.

When you think
of Bread, think of

Golden Krust

For sale by
all Grocers

PASCHALL'S BAKERY

121 North Duke Street

DURHAM, N. C.

FANCY ICES

BLOCK CREAM

Blue Ribbon

Ice Cream

DURHAM ICE CREAM
COMPANY, INC.

We make any color lots for
Frat and Sorority
Banquets

PHONE L-963

MAIN AT DUKE

PUNCHES

SHERBETS

The
Hispanic American
Historical Review

JAMES A. ROBERTSON,
J. FRED RIPPY,
Editors

For the promotion of
good will among the
American family of na-
tions through a better
understanding of their
mutual history.

Published Quarterly
\$4.00 a Year

Complete Back Files Avail-
able at \$5.00 per Volume.

DUKE UNIVERSITY
PRESS
DURHAM, N. C.

R. Blacknall
& Son

Druggists

GEER BUILDING

OPPOSITE POST OFFICE

DURHAM, N. C.

Although no complete back files of the SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY are available, we have full sets from January, 1911, to date. Also a few miscellaneous issues previous to that date.

We offer complete back files of the *Hispanic American Historical Review*.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DURHAM, N. C.

The "Supreme Authority"
WEBSTER'S
NEW INTERNATIONAL
DICTIONARY
—THE MERRIAM-WEBSTER

BECAUSE

Hundreds of Supreme Court Judges concur in highest praise of the work as their *Authority*. The presidents of all leading Universities, Colleges, and Normal Schools give their hearty *indorsement*.

All States that have adopted a large dictionary as *standard* have selected Webster's New International.

The Schoolbooks of the Country *adhere* to the Merriam-Webster system of diacritical marks.

The Government Printing Office at Washington uses it as *authority*.

*Write for Helps
in Teaching the
Dictionary, Free.*

G. & C.
Merriam
Company,
Springfield,
Mass.
Get
The Best!



J. SOUTHGATE
& SONS

Insurance

DURHAM, N. C.

Durham Loan & Trust Co.

*One of the strong, progressive banks of
Greater Durham*

JOHN SPRUNT HILL, President

H. W. BORING, Sec. & Treas.

B. W. ROGERS, Asst. Sec. & Treas.

Building Durham On A Sound Basis

The lesson of thrift and good financial management is the whole curriculum of the Home Savings Bank. By this method we hope that we are contributing to the sound growth of Durham and North Carolina.

THE HOME SAVINGS BANK

"Safest for Savings"

JOHN SPRUNT HILL, President

T. C. WORTH, Cashier

Insurance of All Kinds—

We represent the best companies in the world and wish to extend our services to you.

HOME INSURANCE AGENCY CO.

"Dollars for your Ashes"

Corcoran Street

Phone F-146

DURHAM, N. C.

JOHN A. BUCHANAN, President

CHAS. T. ZUCKERMAN, Secretary

Virginia in the World War

Seven Source Volumes Published by
The War History Commission

Edited by Arthur Kyle Davis

Virginians of Distinguished Service
War History in News Clippings
War Letters, Diaries and Editorials
War Agencies, Draft and Volunteers
Virginia Military Organizations
Virginia Communities (1st Series)
Virginia Communities (2nd Series)

Set of 7 Source Volumes
Handsomely Bound in Cloth
\$2.00 Per Volume; \$12.50 Per Set

Order from
STATE LIBRARIAN, RICHMOND, VA.

Geo. F. Messner Wm. H. Rowe

Carolina Heating and Engineering Co.

HEATING, VENTILATING
and POWER PIPING

*Contractors for Southgate Building
and New Gym*

318 Holland St. Phone J-9441

DURHAM, N. C.



Thirty-Five Years of Experience

In manufacturing made-to-order Fly Screens has been had by this Company and our effort has always been to meet the insistent demand for something better in insect Screens for better houses. A catalog has been prepared for your use which can be had for the asking.

Estimates made without obligation.

THE CINCINNATI FLY SCREEN CO., CINCINNATI, OHIO

Durham Hosiery Mills



"Made strongest where the wear is hardest"

HOSIERY

Suitable for every member of the family

MILLS AT

DURHAM, N. C. - HIGH POINT, N. C. - GOLDSBORO, N. C.
CHAPEL HILL, N. C. - MEBANE, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

DURHAM, N. C.



Woodrow Wilson says:

"We are in this world to provide not for ourselves but for others, and that is the basis of economy."

The man who would provide for his family and aid in the development of national economy will insure his life. It is the safest and most certain way to provide for the future.

The amount of insurance you carry is an indication of your financial judgment and unselfish purpose in life.



C. C. SPAULDING, President

J. M. AVERY, Secretary-Treasurer

W. L. ELKINS, C. P. A.

GEORGE T. DURHAM, C. P. A.

ELKINS & DURHAM

Certified Public Accountants

Richmond, Virginia

Members of

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ACCOUNTANTS
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
VIRGINIA SOCIETY OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

We make a specialty of College and University accounting and invite inquiries regarding accounting problems from officials of such institutions.

The Sewanee Review

QUARTERLY

*Issued in January, April, July, and October
Each number consists of 128 large octavo pages, hand-
somely printed on heavy paper*

SUBSCRIPTION, \$2.00 A YEAR

Single numbers, 50c.

THIS REVIEW, established November 1892, under the auspices of the Faculty of the University of the South, is devoted to reviews of new and important books; to literary criticism; to papers on such topics of general literature as require fuller treatment than they receive in popular magazines and less technical treatment than they receive in specialist publications; and to discussions of vital questions in education, politics, economics, history, philosophy, art, science, and religion. In other words, THE REVIEW conforms more nearly to the type of the English Reviews than is usual with American periodicals. In policy it is not the organ either of an institution or of a church. Without being sectional, it seeks to represent fairly the best spirit of the South in its views on national problems and in its aspirations toward higher ideals.

Intending contributors and publishers desiring to have their important books reviewed will address as indicated below. Where the return of an article is desired, stamps should be enclosed. In all cases the full name of the contributor must be given, though it need not be published.

The Sewanee Review

Sewanee, Tennessee

SCHOOL SUPPLIES

Art Materials
Writing Material
Janitor Supplies

A complete stock carried
in our Winston-Salem
Warehouse.

GRAY & CREECH

INCORPORATED

WINSTON-SALEM, N. C.

CAROLINAS' LARGEST PAPER HOUSE

THOMAS & HOWARD COMPANY

WHOLESALE GROCERS



DURHAM, N. C.
GREENSBORO, N. C.
CHARLOTTE, N. C.
COLUMBIA, S. C.
GREENVILLE, S. C.
SPARTANBURG, S. C.

William and Mary Quarterly

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

Published by the College of William
and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

EDITORS

J. A. C. CHANDLER,
President William and Mary College

E. G. SWEM,
Librarian William and Mary College

The purpose of the *Quarterly* is to
print new information relating to the
history of Virginia.

ISSUED QUARTERLY

Subscription, \$4.00
Single Copy, \$1.00

MIKADO

The
YELLOW
PENCIL
WITH THE
RED
BAND



Have Your
Scribblings
Analyzed

Louise Rice, world famous graphologist,
can positively read your talents, virtues
and faults in the drawings, words and
what notes that you scribble when "lost
in thought."

Send your "scribblings" or signature
for analysis. Enclose the picture of the Mikado
head, cut from a box of Mikado pencils, and
ten cents. Address Louise Rice, care of

EAGLE PENCIL CO., NEW YORK CITY

DUKE UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

THE HUGUENOTS OF COLONIAL SOUTH CAROLINA

By ARTHUR H. HIRSCH

Price \$5.00

(20-odd plates.)

The social, political, and religious contributions of the French Protestants in Carolina. Numerous portraits restored from rare miniatures and oil paintings.

THE NEW ENGLAND CLERGY AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

By ALICE M. BALDWIN

Price \$3.50

Ready about January 25

A study of ecclesiastical thought and practice in its relation to political theory and action in the New England of Revolutionary times.

LOYALISM IN VIRGINIA

Price \$2.50

By ISAAC SAMUEL HARRELL,

Assistant Professor of History in New York University.

Virginia planters were noted for their loyalty to the king. In New England the Revolution was chiefly supported by the merchants. Yet in Virginia most of the merchants were loyalists, while most of the planters supported the Revolution. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were both Virginia planters. Dr. Harrell throws new light on the attitude of these classes in Virginia. In doing so, he helps to explain why men like Patrick Henry were distrustful of the Constitution and why Virginia planters later transferred their support from the Federalists to the party of Jefferson.

GEORGIA AND THE UNION IN 1850

Price \$4.50

By RICHARD HARRISON SHRYOCK,

Associate Professor of History in Duke University.

The policy of Georgia was a highly important factor in the attitude of the lower South toward the Union in the crisis of 1850. The economic and social forces which primarily determined that policy are analyzed by Dr. Shryock in such a way as to further our knowledge of the "Cotton Kingdom" as well as to explain why Georgia preferred Union to Secession during the critical years from 1844 to 1852.

THE STORY OF DURHAM: CITY OF THE NEW SOUTH.

By WILLIAM KENNETH BOYD,

Price \$3.00

Professor of History in Duke University.

The history of the rise of a southern industrial community of peculiar importance written in an interesting manner by a competent historian with a unique opportunity to know whereof he writes.

AN ANTHOLOGY OF VERSE BY AMERICAN NEGROES.

By NEWMAN IVEY WHITE,

Price \$2.00

Professor of English in Duke University.

WALTER CLINTON JACKSON,

Vice-President of the North Carolina College for Women.

"Without doubt the best anthology of American Negro poetry that has yet appeared. . . . There is about it the flavor—the desire, burning and impassioned—to be fair and square to these black bards, to overlook their race and judge their work according to the universally accepted standards of literature. . . . There is an introduction . . . which is the most brilliant, the most illuminating appraisal of Negro poetry."—*The New Republic*.

Catalog on Request.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

DURHAM, N. C.

**High Grade Combed Peeler and Fully Double
Carded Peeler Cotton Yarns, for the Weaving,
Knitting, and Converting Trade**

GRAY MANUFACTURING CO.
FLINT MANUFACTURING CO.
ARLINGTON COTTON MILLS
PARKDALE MILLS, INC.
ARROW MILLS, INC.
MYRTLE MILLS, INC.
ARKRAY MILLS, INC.

GENERAL OFFICES: GASTONIA, N. C.
J. H. Separk, Sec. & Treas. J. L. Gray, Gen. Mgr., Manufacturing

GENERAL SALES OFFICE: 131 East 23rd St., NEW YORK CITY
H. A. Florsheim, General Sales Manager

C. F. DELAMAR

Certified Public Accountant

Washington Duke Hotel Building

Durham, N. C.



Audits

Systems

Tax Service

**SUCH POPULARITY MUST
BE DESERVED**



AND IT IS!

WE STATE it as our honest belief that the tobaccos used in Chesterfield cigarettes are of finer quality and hence of better taste than in any other cigarette at the price.

LIGGETT & MYERS TOBACCO CO.

